

Official Gazette

of the Episcopal Ordinariate of Berlin

October 1934

Official supplement:

Studies on the

myth of the XXth century century

Studies

to the myth of the XXth century century

Official supplement

to the official gazette of the Episcopal Ordinariate of Berlin

Studies on the Myth of the XXth Century
Episcopal Ordinariate Berlin

Translated from: <https://archive.org/details/Amtsblatt101934Mythus>

I hereby present to my reverend priestly colleagues a study that we have all been long awaiting. Since R.'s "myth of the 20th century" has caused deep concern among the believing Christian people in Germany and has threatened the foundations of Christian faith and life right down to young people, the call for solid knowledge has not ceased - professional appreciation of this book. Serious experts use the sources to show with which weapons the author of the myth fights and how far he distances himself from the ground of objective truth. This is how the studies on the "myth of the 20th century" Provide welcome services for your own orientation and for teaching others

Berlin, October 23, 1934.

† Nicolaus
Bishop of Berlin.

Contents

I. On the history of the church.	1-59
First section: Christian antiquity	1-19
A. The picture at R.	1-6
Origin of Christianity	1-3
Chrestos myth 1; Pharisee Saul 1; Etruscans 2; Rome's racial chaos 3	
Persecution of Christians	4
Eusebius eunuch; not reliable; hardly any persecutions; especially the Diocletian persecution (origin, palace fire, course, comparison with Alba's deeds)	
Peacetime	5
Constantine; Council of Nizaa; robber synods; Tertullian's doctrine of indulgences; Augustine; ancient Christian saints	
B. Exam	6-19
Origin of Christianity	6-12
Chrestos myth 6; Paul 6-7; Etruscans 7-12 (Grünmedel's misjudgment 7-10; witch madness and belief in devils by the Etruscans? 10-12)	
Persecution of Christians	12-17
Eusebius 12; the Biocletian persecution 13-17 (Birl's misjudgment 12; origin 12-13; course 13-14; comparison with Alba's actions 15; palace fire 15)	
Peacetime	16-19
Constantine 16-17 (oppression of the Gentiles?, Arian course?); Council of Nicea 17; Robber Synods 17; Tertullian's doctrine of indulgences 18; Augustine 18; ancient Christian saints 18-19	
Second section: The church of the Middle Ages	20-47
A. The picture at R.	20-27
Conversion of the Germanic peoples	20-23
Counterpart of Germanic soul and Christian faith 20; Roger Bacon 21; Scotus Erigena 21; 9 million Kezers murdered 21; Edart's Death 21; Heibnische remainders 21-22 (Wotan St. — Martin; Venus Palagia; Donar Petrus, St. George, St. Michael; Wotan - St. Oswald; Odin St. — Kummernis; conversion of the festivals); Suppression of the National 22	
Cathars and Waldensians	23-24
Church, free humanity and politics	24-25
Gallilei 24; Copernicus 24; Emmeram 24; Constantinian donation 24, Acts of Martyrs 25; fake council minutes 25; decretum Gratiani 25; Pseudo-Kyryl 25; Arnold of Brescia 25; saeculum obscurum 25	

National church efforts in M.-A.?	25-27
Otto I 25; Otto III 25; Willigis of Mainz 25; Cluno 26; Aribio from Mainz 26; Adalbert von Wettin 26; Crusades 26	
B. Exam	27-47
Instruction of the Germanic peoples	27-81
Contrast between the Germanic soul and Christian faith 27; Scotus Erigena 27; Roger Bacon 28; Eckarts Lod 28; Galileo - Copernicus 28-29; pagan remnants 29-30 (St. Martin, Pelagia, St. Peter, St. George, St. Michael, St. Sorrow, Christian festivals); the national and the church 31 (Ludwig the Pious, German language in the church, Visigothic liturgy)	
Kejer persecutions	32-34
Arnold of Brescia 34	
Cathars and Waldensians	34-38
Katharer 34—37; Waldenser 37—38	
Church, free humanity and politics	38-43
9 million murdered heretics 38-40; Emmeram 40; Constantinian donation 43-44; Protocols of the Council of Nizaa 44-45; Martyr Acts 45; decretum Gratiani 45; Pseudo-Cyrillus 45; saeculum obscurum 45	
National church efforts in the M.-A.	44-47
Otto I 44; Otto III 44; Willigis of Mainz 44; Aribio of Mainz 45; Cluny 45-47; Adalbert of Bremen 45; Crusades 47	
Third section: the church of modern times.	48-59
A. The picture at R.	48-50
Renaissance popes	48
Sixtus IV; Innocent VIII; Alexander VI	48
details	48-49
Jesuits 48; Alfons of Ligouri 48; Bramante 48-49	
Rome anti-German?	49-50
Innocent X. 49; Pius IX. 49; Pius XI 49; Meander 50	
Huguenot wars	49
From recent times.	50
Casti connubii; bishop's oath; priestly oath; denominational peace	
B. Exam	50-59
Renaissance popes.	50-53
Sixtus IV 50-52; Meander VL. 50-52; Innocent VIII. 52-53	
details	53-55
Bramante 53; Jesuits 53; Alfons v. Ligouri 53-54	
Rome anti-German	54-55 (57)
Alexander 54; Innocent X. 54-55; Pius IX 57	
Huguenot Frieze	55-56
From recent times...	56-59
Dante 56; Pius IX 57; priestly oath 57; bishop's oath 57; denominational peace 57-59	

II. On Holy Scripture.	60-80
First Section: The Old Testament (A.I.)	60-75
Rating of the A.I. from racial ideas from R. 60-61; Chamberlain 61; Delitzsch 61	60-62
Christ's Commitment to the A.I.	62-65
Christ's recognition of the O.T. 62; Fulfillment of the A.I. in Christ 62; Christ's apostles stand by A. I. 63; also Christ's Church 63; Doctrine of the Vatican Council 64; the Old Testament as a book of humanity 64; Abandonment of Judaism 65	
The Old Testament concept of God	66-69
Bible and natural sciences	70-71
belief in immortality	71-72
Psalms	72
Various corrections	72-74
The A.I. is not yet a perfect precursor to Christianity, far superior to the pagan religions as a revelation from God.	74-75
Second Section: The New Testament (N.I.)	75-80
The Personality of Jesus	76-79
as Son of God 76; Faithfulness of the Gospel Accounts 76; alleged Aryan origin of Jesus 76-77 (Ephrem, Jung's misjudgment, testimony of the N.I.); Jesus Messiah 77-79 (again Chrestos myth and Persian Helland idea); Crucifixus	
Christianity	79-80
Positive and Negative Christianity	
III. Jum Edart problem	81-108
First section: An interpretation	82-85
Second section: Relationship between God and man.	85-94
Your identity	85-91
Difference between God and man	91-92
The analogy	92-94
Third section. The highest values of Master Edart.	94-104
Fourth section: Edart's relationship to the church	104-108
Remarks.	109-118

Sur history of the church

Probably the most impressive part of R.'s presentation for the inexperienced reader, because it appears to be based on a wealth of facts, is the picture that he creates of the Catholic Church and its history. He doesn't draw it in context; Rather, certain basic views and judgments recur again and again in various places, while some details are scattered throughout the book's numerous chapters. Held together by the author's passionate antipathy towards the church, the basic views and individual judgments are purified for the reader into a glaring picture: that of a perverse, even essentially sinister institution.

We want to first try to build up the overall picture from the various passages, and to be sure that we are not exaggerating, if possible using R.'s own words. We arrange things according to the historical sequence and believe that it serves the purpose of clarity if we retain the usual division into Christian predominance, the Middle Ages and modern times. By first putting together what R. says about each of these epochs, we immediately follow the partial picture with an investigation into the accuracy of the information.

first section

Christian antiquity

A. The picture at R.

Christianity, which was introduced into Europe by the Roman Church, is said to have many roots. In Asia Minor, this province affected by Roman taxation, the legend of the slave liberator Chrestos, the Chrestosmhthus, was formed. This myth came to Palestine, where the Jewish idea of the Messiah reigned. Near Eastern Chrestosmhthus and Jewish Messiah ideas were combined and transferred to the personality of Jesus. In addition to his own sermons, the words and teachings of the Near Eastern prophets were put into Jesus' mouth in the form of a paradoxical outdoing of altar demands, such as: B. the 9 commandment system, which had already been corrected for themselves by the Jews in their 10 prohibitions. In this way Galilee connected with all of Shrine and the Near East" (p. 74).

Since this "Christian current, which was stirring up the old ways of life, seemed promising and exploitable to the Pharisee Saul," "he joined it... and preached the international world revolution against the Roman Empire. His teachings form...the Jewish spiritual

towards fundamental death, as it were, the Talmudic-Oriental side of the Roman, but also of the Lutheran Church.... the Jews in Rome will have known very well why they made their synagogues available to him for his propaganda..."

"The Gospel of John, which still breathes an aristocratic spirit, already defended itself against this entire bastardization, Orientalization and Judaization of Christianity..."

"But Rome, thanks to its racial obsession, had become irredeemably committed to Africa and Shrine, had overshadowed the simple personality of Jesus, and had merged the late Roman ideal of the world empire with the ideas of the peopleless world church" (pp. 74-76).

In the "struggle of different racial souls with the current "headed racial chaos" - according to R. the theme of the history of the First Christian centuries - "cleaned up the Ishrisch-border-Asian attitude with its superstition, magic delusions and sensual mysteries, everything chaotic, broken chene and possessed behind them and örüdte to Christianity the ambivalent character that it still has today frank. So a religion tinged with servitude moved gion, shot by the abused, great personality Jesus, in Europe" (p. 76).

In Rome, the wealthy upper class, i.e. H. The destruction of Carthage by the 300 ruling noble families who formed the Senate ensured that later Central and Western European culture was also spared from the exhalations of this Phoenician hotbed" (p. 55), and "world history would have Otherwise perhaps a different course would have taken place if, along with the defeat of Carthage, the destruction of all other Shrine and Near Eastern centers had also been completely successful. However, Titus' act (i.e. the destruction of Jerusalem) came too late; the Border Asiatic Shmaroßer was no longer in power Jerusalem itself, but had already extended its strongest suction arms from Egypt and Hellas against Rome" (pp. 55-56).

According to R., the "border Asian" people of the Etruscans played a special role in the internal attack on Rome. According to him, they were the victims of the most hideous degeneration, the perversion of sexual and religious beings, the victims of the most disgusting obscenities, their "national heritage - well there is nothing but the most inhumane infamy" (pp. 60 to 65). It is true that the "Nordic" Romans had "cleansed Italy of Etruscans with the sword," but "supernumerity, Στᾱ-dition and the usual international unity of all crooks and hustlers ate their way into honorable ancient Roman life more and more the further it went Securing those values in the morass of the Mediterranean

was forced to grab. In particular, Rome was unable to overcome the (Etruscan) Harusper and the (also Etruscan) Augurs (p. 66), and the "human sacrifices that recurd in the most horrific form towards the end of the Republic" and the gladiator fights are Etruscan poisoning (p. 66 f.) But the horrible Etruscan nature lived on in the Roman Church: "The Haruspex was victorious, the Roman Pope rose up as his immediate successor, while the Templar rule, the follegium of cardinals, were a mixture of the priesthood of the Etruscan-Shro-Near Asians and of the Jews with the Nordic Senate of Rome. Our medieval world view also goes back to this Etruscan Haruspex, that terrible belief in magic, that witch madness to which millions of the West fell victim, which did not die out with the witch's hammer, but still lives on merrily in today's ecclesiastical literature, ready every day to openly say Herborzibtefep, that Etruscan-bastardized „Antife, which also comes to life in Dante's Inferno. Because "the Etruscans linger with sadistic love on all depictions of torment, murder, sacrifice; the slaughter of human beings itself was a particularly popular magic"... "This Near Eastern people... poisoned the Roman blood, their rhetorical ideas of the torments of hell in the afterlife transferred to the churches, the horrible animal-human demons have become permanent means of influence of the papacy and dominate the imagination of our Middle Ages, which was poisoned by the Roman Church, about which painting alone provides frightening information - even on the Isenheim Altar, not to mention the journeys into hell of other visual artists. Only when you have recognized this whole alien being, have become aware of its origins and have the will to resist, face this entire terrible ghostly creature only then will we have overcome the Middle Ages. This also means that the Roman Church, which is forever linked to the torments of the Etruscan underworld, internally collapsed (pp.

67-69). With Christianity, R. thinks, the entire depravity of the Near East has moved into Rome, which was once called "Shrish", then „as [Hro-Phoenician", or as Judeo-Fhrish", then again as "Jewish "or also appears as "African". In Rome it has combined with the still lingering remnants of the most horrible thing on earth, the Etruscan being, and it is precisely this terrible mixture that lives on in the Roman Church, especially in the papacy . Your Jewish ment is above all the Jahbe, "the demon raised to God" (p. 47), the "demon Jahve" (p. 250), who arouses R.'s complete disgust Ele - "unity god" of monotheism (p. 127), that world view,

who in all seriousness thinks of the cosmos as being created out of nothing arbitrarily," "a thought that is insane for us" (p. 597 and 248), which will therefore also proclaim an arbitrary God who recognizes fine inner ties," 6en "God-Thrann" (p. 597 etc.). The Etruscan element, however, is "the magic-believing, blood-thirsty wejen of Rome" and its pope, which R. never tires of, as a "medicine man" (p. 173, 598, etc.), as an "Etruscan haruspex" (p. 67, etc.). . 6.), to be described as a "Roman haruspex" (p. 615).

R. has nothing but negative things to say about the early history of the church. We have good knowledge of the early history of the Church through Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, the author of the first history of the Church. J. 323. About "the eunuch Eusebius does not represent a historical source" (p. 74).

Everyone thinks of the heroic early Christian martyrs. However, in contrast to Eusebius' report, there is no mention of any real persecution of Christians, especially not of the persecution under Emperor Diocletian, which is reported to have been particularly severe. Because this "man of religious tolerance" was opposed by "uninhibited insults from the Christians", whose violent stubbornness and mutual fighting threatened the whole of civil life in other ways too. When the state finally resorted to defensive action for the purpose of self-preservation. . . the answer was riot, arson in the emperor's palace. Challenges from the Christian communities from all over the empire, which had previously remained unmolested and had therefore become presumptuous, followed a naþ 6er an6eten". As a result, "nine rebellious bishops were executed" and in the province of the most violent resistance, Palestine, a total of 80 sentences of zodiac were carried out - the whole, supposedly terrible persecution, in reality nothing compared to the 100,000 kegers executed in Bon Alba in the Netherlands" (p .

71-73). Julian Apostate fought no less "precisely on the basis of his pious attitude against the teachers of God's trespass". Rightly so: "for no sooner had Christianity become the state religion through Constantine than the Old Testament spirit of hatred made a terrible appearance "With reference to the Old Testament, the Christians demanded the application of the penalties written there against idolatry" (p.73).

From Constantine's testimony we further learn that "the Nicene Creed was adopted by a majority vote of monks, most of whom could not read or write," just as otherwise "the doctrines came about on robbers' nests where people were killed - religious questions were decided" (p. 133), and finally: the fact that Constantine was baptized in the Arian way is suppressed" (p. 523; R. means: from Catholic church historiography). Reading about the inner life of the church we that the African

It was Tertullian in particular who developed the merchant doctrine of indulgences with a great deal of legal acumen" (p. 170), that Syrian-African sons of the desert taught the creation of matter from nothing - which would have appeared to any Indian Aryan as blasphemous materialism and Rome with its demon Jahve adopted this doctrine" (p. 250). The St. Augustine is the "slavish half-African" (p. 237). When the "much later" falsification of the passage Mt. 16, 18-19 (bon Peter, the rock) is said to have occurred is not specified (p. 161). . Let us assume that, according to R., it still took place at least in Christian antiquity. But there is no doubt in his mind that the magical priesthood of Rome, as a continuation of the priestly societies of the Near and Middle Asia, corrupted antiquity to such an extent that, as a necessary result, St. Eusebius walked around with chains weighing 260 pounds, St. Macarius himself bought sainthood by enduring the pain of an anthill in which he sat, St. Francis - certainly a very great personality in many ways - paid tribute to Asianism by rolling around naked on thorns for the pleasure of God. Particularly pious ones Nuns drank other people's saliva, ate dead mice and rotten eggs, all in order to become saints. St. Hilarius is praised because he only lived in filth... With the unrestrained development of this smell of holiness, Europe would be today We have reached the state of the staring saints of India and Tibet, a state of complete stupidity, the most terrible superstition, poverty and misery - with the constant enrichment of the priestly caste. Europe was saved by the entirety of the anti-Roman movements, and the greatest savior of the West is Martin Luther because he fought the being from which the outlined circumstances arose as necessary results: the magical, powerful priesthood of Rome as a continuation of the priestly societies of the Near and Middle Asia" (p. 185).

This is the picture of the old church! Not a word about the purity of their monotheistic teaching, which according to him is just a disgusting outgrowth of the Asian spirit compared to the polytheism of the ancient peoples, not a word of admiration for their great saints and martyrs, not a word about the brotherly love and great caritas of the ancient Christians, from their sublime worship, from the mighty struggle of their great spirits for the truth, for the capture and rescue of what was imperishable in the wisdom and science of antiquity, even for the student of revelation. But let us leave silent all the feelings of the heart, all the inner well of the Christian who knows his Church and has her real, her glorious image before his eyes.

Let's calmly check the information that makes up R.'s picture.

R. writes: "In Asia Minor the Romans practiced a strict regiment and relentlessly collected their taxes; As a result, the oppressed population began to hope for a slave leader and liberator. That was the legend of Chrestos. From Asia Minor, this Chrestosmthos reached Palestine, was vividly taken up, linked to the Jewish idea of the Messiah and finally transferred to the personality of Jesus" (p. 74).

In reality, the legend of Chrestos did not exist in Asia Minor. This means that this entire theory of the origins of Christianity collapses!

The Roman writer Suetonius probably wrote a biography of the Emperor Claudius around the year 120. There it is said that Claudius "expelled from Rome the Jews who were constantly inciting unrest at the instigation of a certain Chrestos" (Vita Claudii 25). Just as today not every writer is familiar with all faiths and does not always make the effort to keep the individual efforts apart, namely the religion of the blood, the German religious movement, the German religion, the Young Germanic religion, the New Spirit movement, etc., for many Romans of the early Christian community, the differences between the individual Jewish religious movements (Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Grecians) were important (Philonists, Judaizers) were irrelevant, and Christianity often appeared to them as some kind of Jewish sett. How uncomprehending Pilate, for example, was towards the religious questions of the Jews. This is also how Suetonius' note mentioned above is explained. (Chrestos is nothing other than that established form of the word Christ. In late Greek, which was also spoken in Rome at the time, e often alternates with i, Itacism, or i with e, Etacism.) - The sermon of the joyful Messiah Christ naturally caused great unrest in the Jews of that time. Claudius's expulsion order affected Mosaic and Christian Jews indiscriminately. Acts 18, 2 also tells of this expulsion. - From the far-fetched note by the Roman Suetonius, which doesn't even explain the context, a whole myth now develops in R., namely the Near East (1) Chrestosmthos!

But what about the role of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles? Paul certainly does not believe in political and social revolution! Read etiva Titus 2. 9, 1 Timothy 6, 1 f., Colossians 3, 22 ff. and others. m. How does the letter to Philemon reveal that Paul is not running against political or social orders, but that he is proclaiming a new evaluation of things and people with the teaching of Jesus Christ and in its power. In the letter to the Romans, however, Paul explains in more detail why Christians must remain loyal to the secular authorities. I quote this passage in its entirety:

"Let everyone be subject to the authority of the authorities. For there are subtle things that do not come from God; where one exists, it is ordained by God. Accordingly, anyone who rebels against violence is a rebel against God's order; but the rebels bring judgment upon themselves. The authorities are a terror, not for good work, but for evil work. If you do not want to be threatened by violence, do right and you will receive praise from it. She is God's helper for good for you. But you want it

Evil, be afraid; She doesn't wear the schvert for nothing. For she is God's helper and carries out punishment on those who do evil.

Therefore one must be subject to it, not only for the sake of punishment, but also for the sake of conscience; That's why you pay taxes. For those who are responsible for this service are officers of God. Pray to everyone what you owe: tax to whom; Boll, to whom Boll; Fear whomever fears; and honor to whom it is due" (Romans 13:1-7).

Is this what an international revolutionary writes? We ask the reader to also read the Epistle to Philemon itself (it is almost a printed page long), then it will be clear to him how Baulus stands high above R.'s accusations!

It is equally incorrect that Paul, bending the teachings of Jesus, formed Christianity in the first place, and under the protest of the Gospel of John! Anyone who reads the Gospels and the letters of Paul and the writings of 30-Hannes certainly senses that men of very strong character and unwavering individuality wrote these holy writings, but it also becomes clear to him that the entire New Testament is just a teaching wants to declare, the teaching of Christ, who Paul and John are servants, the teaching of Christ, as we still have and hold it today. We have just learned an impressive example of how Paul teaches the teachings of his divine master: what Paul writes about obedience is the same as what Jesus says: "Pray to the emperor what is the

emperor's". Well, one will ask, one cannot so easily make claims about the Chrestos myth, Paul's revolution, John's protest; there will also be reasons. Unfortunately one has to answer: There are be - there are no reasons for this. We are simply confronted with allegations, and false allegations at that.

The Etruscan people, the Near Eastern parasites", According to R., in his racial remnants, is the recipient and propagator of the pernicious Asian Christian faith. R.'s view of the Etruscan is a very important cornerstone in the building he stands before us want to raise up; the recurring denunciation of the Etruscan

Haruspex and the like testify to this. But what do we really know about the Etruscans? Unfortunately, R. is in his efforts to quickly get material against them from everywhere Church and Christianity together, fell victim to a book that serious science only accepted with a shake of the head and regret at the author's spiritual confusion: Albert Grünwedel, Tusca, Leipz. 1922.

Grünwedel, who made a name for himself in previous works, fell victim to delusional complexes in this book. His preoccupation with the Indian cave paintings, which were foreign to us Europeans and whose confusion was ultimately unappealing, gave him the idea of looking for the leitmotif of Indian-Buddhist art in Frankish sexual Berbers and ultimately also the enigma of the Etruscan language, mythology and art out of sexual perversity. Critics, out of pity for the previously esteemed author, kept the unfortunate book "Tusca" quiet as much as possible. As far as the alleged decipherment of the Etruscan language is concerned, the only possible key to the horrific Etruscan ideas and customs claimed by Grünwedel, so Unfortunately, the Etruscan language is still a sealed book

all linguists. The way in which Grünwedel tries to close the seal solve is, you can't use a milder expression, pure madness. The hideous sexual perversities that he believes he has discovered are therefore not to be found among the Etruscans, but unfortunately in his own French imagination. Given the importance of the matter, since the alleged racial Etruscan poisoning is fundamental for R., it is permissible to mention the following: In 1923, Gustav Herbig, an outstanding expert on Etruscan culture and art, appeared in the Munich meeting reports Academy of Sciences an essay that exposes in detail the absolute unscientific nature of Grünwedel's book. With regard to G.'s language decipherment, Herbig dares to summarize, albeit with deep regret, the words of condemnation that are almost unheard of among scholars (p. 19): I can... with a clear conscience say the same thing that Grünwedel himself repeatedly says of the Etruscan texts revealed by him: "a crazy product'... idiotic jokes'..., genuine Etruscan letter engravings and baseness'... etymologically dirty jokes'... almost crazy untranslatable gibberish', etc Grazie in infinitum." At the end of his criticism, Herbig writes (p. 24 f.): "The cruel risum teneatis amici, which forces itself on the lips of the serious researcher, very soon solidifies into a yawning hiatus teneatis among those hungry for sensation amici; confused by human and all-too-human things, "scientifically digging his own grave with his own hands" in foreign soil. Wilhelm Schubart, the famous Berlin orientalist, then denounced Grünwedel's book and Herbig's essay, writing that Herbig "out of real expertise, clearly, without derision and without gloating, dismisses these fantasies in such a way that even the layman can immediately see what they are A sharp mind could fall into a frightening aberration. Anyone who has only a little pure sense, who has acquired only a little understanding of the nature of human language, hardly needs a guide before despairing after a few pages, not about Etrus fishing, but certainly about greentails. Now that this book is finished, it wouldn't be appropriate to throw another stone at it. But I won't specify its contents either; for it must be forgotten as quickly as possible, for the sake of the author and for the sake of German science." In Latvia, science has tried to grant this merciful forgetting to the sad outgrowth of Grünwedel's diseased imagination; foreign science has also been mild The cloak of silence has been placed over them. Of course, we too would not act differently for the sake of the very old scholar who has done a good job in previous situations. But after R. has done exactly what Schubart did "for the sake of German science" wanted to be avoided, and Grünwedel's book not only made the basis for his view of Roman Christianity, but also laid out the sad contents on many pages in front of the reader, unfortunately there is nothing left but the verdict of the real experts on Etruria here for the reader to communicate 4a.

There are even some differences as to which tribe the Etruscans were from. Sufficiently certain knowledge. Such great researchers as Niebuhr, Otfried Müller, Helbig et al. (Gesell, Pigorini, Lattes) considered the Etruscans to be members of the Indo-European (i.e. Aryan) ethnic group, which also includes the Umbrians, Sabellians, Oskians and Latins, for us natives of Italy, belong. Others, more recent researchers such as Gaetano De Sanctis and Luigi Pareti suspect them a people who immigrated from the Alps in the Neolithic period. Again others, I only mention Körte, Furtwängler, Herbig from German researchers and Kretschmer, think of an immigration of the Etruscans from Asia Minor around 700 b. BC, whereby they assimilated the subjugated Umbrians; and others, like Hrozný, consider them to be the remains of a very old population that already before the year 1000 BC it was spread from the mountains of Lhden in the 1st century BC all the way to Spain, where the powerful Basques left their surviving remnants represent. So while the serious researchers have not yet come to a convincing conclusion Results have come where, especially despite the great ones used on it

No one can yet boast of the mystery of the Etruscan language To have solved it, R. relies on the erroneous thoughts of one of delusional thoughts Plagued who discovered a hotbed of immorality and meanness in Italy imagined himself to have, and thus finds a racial basis for all

gen, now boldly called Etruscan, Etruscan-Syrian, Asiatic, Phoenician, etc. described atrocities that took place in the baptism and the Catholic Church the racial impact should continue! It is

interesting to see how he (p. 62 note) uses Karl Otfried Müller, one of the best-known older researchers, in order to at least have a key witness, by boldly changing the quote in question. He writes: "The extremely cautious explorer of Etruria, Karl Otfried Müller, who in the first half of the 19th century was of course not able to overlook the entire racial question as we do today, writes in his great work "The Etruscans" (newly published by Dr. W. Deede, Stuttgart 1877) about the Dionysia, which apparently had an affinity with the Etruscan nature, at first only women were initiated; only long afterwards, in Rome around 550 BC, men were also initiated, the Etruscan priests then had "those hideous orgies were formed in which the mind, numbed by Phrygian kymbalen and timpani music, inflamed with bacchic lust and uncontrolled greed, subjected itself to all atrocities until the Roman Senate (568) abolished all bacchanalia with salutary severity" (vol. II, p. 78). In truth, Müller says in the relevant passage that Etruria received the cult of Dionysus, to which its art monuments testify, while its state festivals showed a fine trace of an orgiastic festival frenzy, "among the landscapes of Italy, first from the Greek municipalities", and that after later Men were also initiated, large meals and banquets in Etruscan taste were added and those hideous orgies were carried out by Campanian (i.e. Greek again!) and Etruscan priests... until the Roman Senate (568) with salutary severity abolished all Bacchanalia in Italy with the exception of a few "old and traditional customs".

Why is R. missing Müller's double reference to the Greeks as the authors of the Bacchanalian exuberances?

In Grünwedel and R. you have to read the entire concentration of everything perverted and obscene, from the defilement of boys to the visceral phramide and the pile of excrement in the cult and life of the Etruscans, the true scum of humanity, in order to understand which ones are not to be missed at all - Offering identification lies in the term "Etruscan" for baptism and church!

R. also blames the Etruscans for the introduction of the witch craze, because this makes it easier to pin this blame on the papacy, which transplanted this Etruscan craze into the Germanic Middle Ages. Germanic culture was of its own accord free from him. What is reality like? Belief in witches was widespread in the Orient and the West, especially among the Celts and the ancient Germanic peoples. With regard to the Lombards, reference only needs to be made to the Edictum Rothari (Rothari was king 637-52), where the soldering of Heren is forbidden with certain fines depending on the status of the murderer, because a Christian should not believe that there are witches, and that a woman could devour a person alive," which was apparently believed by the pagan Lombards (Mon. Germ. Leg. IV, ed. Berz, p. 87). Charles 6th Gr. c. takes us even deeper 6 of the Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae bliden, which decrees: "If anyone, deceived by the devil, should believe, nad) way of the heathen, that a man or a woman is a witch (ftriga) and eats people, and therefore she If he burns himself and gives her meat to eat or eats it himself, he is said to be guilty of lodes (Mon. Germ. Leg. II, I, 1. p. 68). So it was not only the belief in witches that was alive among the Saxons , but it also happened that the supposed witches were burned and their roasted meat was consumed. The church initially fought against the witch craze with laudatory zeal. A sermon from the 8th or 9th century says: "Many people believe that there are witches and say that they eat children, cattle and horses and do other evil things. One should not believe this because the wise refute it. There has never been a Here, and there never will be; But the devil says such words through people who are not blessed." In the so-called Canon Episcopi, a Frankish shnodal statute from the 9th century, we read that the priests are warned to take a stand against the delusion spread by the women in question themselves that women were summoned to the service of the pagan goddess, the canon calls her Diana, at night, riding on Gevissen ornaments (Regino von Prüm, De synodalibus causis II, 371). That there were women who said this about themselves, This becomes completely credible if, in the 19th century, people in Sweden had the greatest difficulties with women who claimed to be witches and claimed to have been to Blodsberge. Weiser-Vall is right when he reports on this Shivedic madness , in his large article on witches in the Handbook of German Superstition Vol can, shows,

thow much the belief in witches is at home in the Germanic tradition itself.

The burning of witches is also an old Germanic custom, nothing other than rendering harmless the female and also the male builder whose machinations one fears, and how strong such superstition can be can be judged from the fact that the "Baseler Nachrichten" was published on the 9th July 1934 (!) from Linthal, a town in the (non-Catholic) canton of Glarus, reported that a farmer had set fire to a house in order to burn the woman living there as a witch because she had bewitched two horses for him. - The men Unfortunately, the church gradually capitulated to the belief in witches, especially in the German countries, until finally in 1484 the German inquisitors Jakob Sprenger and Heinrich Institoris even received the requested recognition of their jurisdiction in their action against Pope Innocent VIII the alleged evil activity of the witches and wrote the shameful witch's hammer. So the witch craze did not come to Germany from Etruria or Rome, but unfortunately an old Germanic folklore that was not combated steadfastly enough by the church.

This is why the madness blossomed at its worst in Germany after the religious separation. Luther, Zwingli and Calvin paid homage to him in the same way; Protestant England, the Scandinavian empires and the Protestant immigrant states of North America also carried out a severe persecution of witches, while in Rome the belief that had become quite general about the possibility of the devil's alliance of witches and its use to carry out harmful acts was not rejected, but it was in Theory and practice were only allowed with an unmistakable degree of caution. That's why there were only a few witch trials in Rome and their complete cessation there in the 17th century, while in Germany the unfortunate madness continued to claim its victims until the end of the 18th century.

What R. writes in this same context about the papacy's guilt in the spread of the spooky belief in the devil does not stand up to research. The biblical teaching of fallen angels, evil spirits, coincided throughout the ancient world with pre-Christian popular ideas about demons. For a race that did not have natural explanations for so many illnesses and natural disasters as we do, belief in the effectiveness of demons had become completely self-evident. But because it was so general and self-evident, it couldn't have been any other way than for it to live on for a long time and to associate itself with the Christian doctrine of pure spirits who had become sinful in many ways, and this doctrine often enough in the worst possible way coarsened or completely disfigured. It was not Christianity that created the fear of demons, but that fear was there.

But Christianity, especially ancient Christianity, taught how to overcome this fear religiously by trusting in Christ. This certainly did not happen as quickly or as satisfactorily as we would like, and ultimately, along with the belief in witches, an unfortunate belief in the ghost of the devil has also spread. A look at the history of superstition among Germanic and non-Germanic peoples shows that the servants of the church would have had to stand entirely outside the spirit of their ministry if they were to have been free from all fears of ghosts.

The origin of Christianity was neither border-Asiatic-Mathitic, nor Pharisaic-Pauline, nor subhuman-Etruscan. The beginning of Christianity is the becoming manifest of the Son of God, who descended from heaven for the sake of our salvation and became man from Mary the Virgin by the Holy Spirit. "Life has appeared and we have seen it, and we show and proclaim to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us. We therefore declare to you what we have seen and heard: for you also shall have fellowship with us. Our fellowship is with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ!" 1 John 1, 2, 3.

We move on to the details of Christian antiquity. Eusebius of Caesarea, the father of church history and our main source for much of its early history, calls R. a eunuch and he summarily rejects his credibility. Any expert in church history will be as amazed by one as by the other. The Church has always treated castration as an obstacle to admission to the clergy. Since it was extremely widespread in the Roman Empire, and was often carried out on unfree people against their will, the first general council in Nicaea i. J. 325, in its first canon (summary resolution), expressly excludes from the clergy, and not just from the priesthood, anyone who, with his consent, has lost his manhood. Only those who suffered the procedure against their will at the hands of the barbarians (i.e. when taken prisoner of war) or because of their illness were allowed to remain in the clergy. Eusebius was himself a member of this council.

As far as I can tell, no one apart from R. has ever questioned his reliability as a historian, whether Catholic or Protestant. He must therefore also be considered reliable in his reports about the persecution of Christians.

The source from which R. draws his hateful views about the Christians in the time of persecution is easy to determine after a reference on p. 73, note: the book by Th. Birt, *Late Roman Character Images* (not, as R. states: *Character Images Spätroms*), Leipzig 1919 (or 2nd edition, Leipzig 1922). Birt was an outspoken opponent of the church and, where the church was concerned, often lacked the necessary criticism, including with regard to the persecution of Christians. But R. not only adopts, but also blindly expands or modifies Birt's presentation in an anti-church sense.

Let us see that Diocletian was a ruler of strength and statesmanship, that he was not an enemy of Christians in his own right, but tolerated Christianity so much, even in his immediate surroundings, that it experienced a powerful upswing under his reign, is common property not only of historical science, but especially of Catholic church historiography. Diocletian's own wife and daughter were close to Christianity. After almost 20 years of peace, the ancient pagan party, especially the co-emperor Galerius, managed to turn Diocletian against Christianity and to influence him to make the extreme attempt

to eradicate Christianity. R. first emphasizes, following Birt p. 122, the Germanic racial element in his hero Diocletian, a Dalmatian son of a slave (p. 58: "perhaps of half-Germanic descent", p. 72: "presumably Germanic half-breed, of white Body skin, blue-eyed"), although Birt himself points out the uncertainty of the relevant sources a little later (note 34). Actually, we as Germans shouldn't be too proud of this prince, who was the actual founder of despotism and orientalism in the Roman imperial administration and the empire. Birt himself points this out when he quotes Diocletian's own words: "I must live like this in isolation, and the life of the people does not touch me, and I do not learn the truth. The most benevolent and cautious monarch is abused and betrayed; for my friends at Lisch are without integrity, my court society is evil followers, the chamberlains are foolish, the eunuchs are full of greed. Five or six people are conspiring to deceive and cheat the ruler. That's how it is with us." And Birt adds, not incorrectly: "That remains the sigh of all caliphs and sultans!" It is understandable that under these circumstances Diocletian was driven into persecution of Christians by those around him. Catholic historical research has therefore distinguished Diofletian's own guilt from that of his advisors and co-emperors and from that of the circumstances of the time. According to the quotation marks placed by R., the "monster Diocletian" can be understood as a quotation, albeit without specifying the source, and I do not remember ever having read it in a Catholic history work. Further: Birt writes (p. 146), where he lists the reasons that, in his opinion, persuaded Diocletian and his co-regents to abandon their previous friendly position against the Christians: "There was also another reason that was expressly asserted by them "The cult system within the church itself also brought constant strife and the most spiteful fights into the general public, into the whole of civil life, which in the long run seemed unbearable to the guardians of the state's well-being." In note 45, Birt refers to the church history of Eusebius VIII, 17 and the Lactantius writing: De mortibus persecutorum (On the types of death of the persecutors of Christians) c. 34. The two authors reproduce the edict of tolerance issued by co-emperor Diocletian Galerius I, who was afflicted with severe illness. J. 311 stopped his cruel persecution. But there is not a single syllable about Christian sects or the like in Galerius' decree. Birt has obviously fallen victim to a superficiality in his work, just as the whole claim is nonsensical. What does R. do with the error in his submission? Without repeating Birt's, even if false, at least restrictive, addition that the emperors had invoked an intolerable Christian system of violence for their persecution, R. (p. 72) simply says: "This (the farewell to the military service because of the Christians' alleged refusal to serve) resulted in unrestrained insults from the Christians, whose stubbornness and mutual fighting also threatened the whole of civil life in other ways. The state then finally took action for the purpose of self-preservation

It wants to defend itself - similar to Germany today
"The pacifist movement must not be completely destroyed." Everything in this is wrong. The persecution was not caused by the written soldiers' refusal to serve; my source knows something about it was long in the making, may have been accelerated by the fact that at a sacrificial display in the winter of 302-3 the Haruspex blamed the lack of the expected signs on the unpreservation of Christians who made the sign of the cross during the pagan funeral, and Diofletian then blamed everyone the palace officials and the soldiers, who demanded participation in the pagan sacrifice under penalty of dismissal from service. Then on February 23, 303 an edict was suddenly posted in Nicomedia, which called for the destruction of all Christian places of worship, the burning of their holy scriptures, the consecration and , insofar as they belonged to privileged classes, degrading Christians insofar as they were freedmen, converting them into slave status, and depriving all Christians of their legal capacity in court. In the same location, the Christian church in Nifomedien was completely destroyed and in fact the saints were also destroyed. Writings burned. A Christian who took the unjust edict from the wall and tore it to pieces was burned alive. This is the data collected from the sources by all historians, regardless of their faith, with which one can compare R.'s presentation. Birt praises the leniency of this law because it did not yet threaten the death penalty, and says kindly: "The emperor certainly threatened the merchants with praise and execution, who drained the public of their trade with dizzyingly high prices; mind you, he did not threaten the Christians; He didn't want to shed blood." It would also have been a bit too much for peaceful Christian citizens, who at that time already made up a very significant minority in large areas and in some cases the majority of the population, to die in the first edict . Three further edicts, which were issued in rapid succession, then ordered the imprisonment of all Christian leaders, their torture if they did not want to sacrifice, and then the coercion of all Christians in general through torture and violence to sacrifice, thereby signaling the most horrific The most cruel persecution was given. Birt now at least admits the increase in cruelty, that "from year to year the resistance grew, the so-called confessors increased, the terribleness of the torture and screaming increased and yet still proved fruitless" (p. 153), but then at the end (p. 155) it is completely wrong to say that only 9 bishops were among the victims of persecution, that in Palestine the persecution was particularly severe, but ultimately in all of them Only 80 Lodes sentences were carried out, so for the other areas e.g. T. would have to assume much lower numbers; whereas in the small Netherlands under M6a at the time of Egmont and William of Orange, 100,000 Protestants died of faith."

Birt should only have read the text in Eusebius, to which he refers (KG. VIII, 13), to see that Eusebius does not list the bishops here, but only a few martyrs, some of them priests, who are particularly worthy of his praise , partly bishops, the place with the number of martyred bishops

He should have read Eusebius's writings about the Martyrs of Palestine more carefully in order to see that the number in question is also incorrect, and he should have learned a little more about the history of the about the secession of the Netherlands, namely that the Egmont he mentioned was not a Protestant but a Catholic, as was his comrade in death, Count Hoorn, and at that time William of Orange. For this latter matter was such that because of the abolition of the old freedoms in the Spanish Netherlands by Philip II, the rebellion broke out, which only in one line of the Dutch was linked to the Calvinist struggle against Catholicism, and only to a greater extent As a result of Duke Alba's harshness against the freedom fighters, as with William of Orange after his escape from his homeland, Alba's blood sentences only partly affected Protestants, but often Catholics. One can safely say that without Alba, Holland would still be Catholic today. The number of 100,000 Mba's victims that Birt cites is just made out of thin air.

Now read R.'s account, revised by Birt, which follows directly from the passage quoted above on p. 14 (p. 72 f.): "But here too (R. means the criminal pacifism he assumed) Diofletian imposed In the case of rebellious people, not the punishment of lodes, as he had ordered in the case of commercial fraud, but rather the banishment to the Sflabenstand. The answer was riot, arson in the emperor's palace. Challenges from the Christian communities from the empire that had previously remained unmolested and had therefore become presumptuous followed one after the other. The resulting "terrible persecutions of Christians" by the "monster Diocletian" resulted in 9 rebellious bishops being executed and in the province of the most violent resistance, Palestine, a total of 80 death sentences being carried out." The most Christian Duke Alba, however, left 100,000 prisoners in the small Netherlands alone execute."

A comment on the arson in the palace. Lactantius reports (c. 14) that Diocletian's whipper, Galerius, had secretly hidden servants set fire to the emperor's palace in order to then blame it on the Christians and break Diofletian's resistance to the extreme measures demanded of him, which gave him It also succeeded, although the examination and torture of the palace servants did not reveal any guilt, and certainly no blame for Christians. It wasn't people from the palace who set the fire, but people from Galerius, to whom the investigation was cautiously not extended. The Protestant historian of the ancient church, the fanatical Uchelis, remarks: "Who will want to undertake to ascertain the truth? Caesar Galerius can be trusted with any wickedness; A sophistication such as would be present in this case is not beyond the realm of possibility." Birt at least says: "The suspicion was only too obvious: the Christian court officials." For R. it is a given that the Christians started the fire. This is how the guilty become

the innocent and from the innocent the guilty in the Christian Church tracking time made.

Going even further than Birt, R. wants to trivialize the persecution of Christians. Just read Eusebius's completely factual report, and you won't take it for nothing when he reports from Egypt that "countless men with wives and children, for the sake of the teaching of our Savior, with contempt for earthly life suffered death in different ways. Some of them were consigned to the flames after they had experienced claws and torture and received terrible blows from scourges and endured countless other legs of various kinds, harsh to hear, others were sunk into the sea, still others bravely offered their necks to the executioners. Some died During the tortures, Anbet found death by starvation, others were euthanized, some in the manner usual for criminals, others were pinned upside down to greater torment and kept alive until they themselves starved to death on the beams" (KG. VIII, 8). "But the torments and sufferings that the martyrs endured in the Thebaid defy all description. Instead of claws, shards tore their entire bodies until death occurred. Women were tied to one of their two feet and their heads downwards with certain machines pulled high into the air... Others were tied to trees and trunks and in this way found the Γο6. Tan 30g namely the strongest vests hard together using certain machines, attaching a leg to each one Märthr and allowed the fortress to snap back into its natural position. This meant that the limbs of the unfortunate would be torn in one go. And all this was not done just for a few days or just for a short time, but for long years. "Sometimes more than ten, sometimes more than twenty of them were executed, at other times no less than thirty, even around sixty and sometimes even a hundred men, along with women and children, were sentenced in a variety of different places in one place" (ibid. c. 9). Nobody, Anyone who is only slightly familiar with the sources of our knowledge of the martyrdoms will dare to portray this terrible time of suffering with its countless witnesses to faith from Spain to the borders of Persia, as R. does. No!, what Birt offers is a completely wrong picture, and what R. makes of Birt no longer has the slightest thing to do with reality.

Just like what R. read about the time of persecution, what he claims about the time of peace is also incorrect. Constantine did not take any measures against paganism inspired by the spirit of Old Testament hatred. He didn't even need to do so because paganism had long been rotten internally and had been rapidly declining since the emperor left him. So at first he quietly took over the temple services let it exist, except for a few immoral ones. Whether in a later edict he forbade the construction of new images of gods, fortune-telling and finally even sacrifices is highly doubtful. In any case, history knows of his pagan bet something was done by Constantine for the sake of his faith , and the temples remained open to the pagans. It was only his sons Constans and Constantius who banned sacrifices in the temples in 341; the private practice of paganism became

continues to be tolerated. But there was not a pagan martyr of his faith among them either.

R.'s remark regarding Constantine's "Arian baptism" is also wrong or at least misleading. In every Catholic textbook on church history, including those for schools, one can read that Constantine later turned his favor back to Arius, who was condemned in Nicaea, and his how - the acceptance into the church community was carried out, furthermore that shortly before his lode, Constantine received the barrel from the bishop of the royal city of Nicomedia, Eusebius, a partisan of Arius. However, only those who can speak of an "Arian" barrel can therefore speak of it has no concept of the nature and essence of the Arian question. At that time, in the year 337, Arians in the sense of a religious community separate from the church did not yet exist.

The monks who are said to have decided on the "Nicaene Symbolum" belong to the realm of free invention. There was not a single monk among the approximately 200-300 members of the council, for the simple reason that Monasticism did not yet exist or rather began to emerge around this time. The first monastery did not arise in Egypt until around 320, i.e. at the time of the Council of Nicaea. There were very few priests among the monks at first, and for a long time it took a while after Nicaea for men who had come from the monastic class to be elevated to episcopal orders. Furthermore, one would have looked in vain at the council for a bishop who could not read and write. The old church valued it on electing noble and educated members of the community

as bishops. "The robbers' heads" on which the The Church's doctrinal councils came into being," one might call us. As is well known, the word "Robber Synod" was coined by none other than Pope Leo I, i.e. St., who in 451 in a letter to the Empress Pulcheria calls the synod this way, at which the violent and domineering Patriarch Dioscurus of Alexandria in Ephesus had the assembled bishops seen under pressure by the imperial military and monks brought from Egypt. This synod was to accept the teaching of Ubtas Eutyches, which had already been rejected by a letter from Pope Leo (and solemnly condemned immediately after this Ephesian Shnode by the Council of Chalcedon) that Christ did not possess a true human nature. When Dioscurus did not reach his goal quickly enough and the excitement about the pressure on his conscience that he was exerting increased, he himself pretended to be the one in danger, summoned the military, who dragged the Patriarch of Constantinople, Flavian, away by force, and fanatized the monks he had brought with him, so that the intimidated assembly decided in his favor. No one other than the Pope branded this raped assembly of bishops, which was not a council, which did not proclaim a doctrine accepted by the church, but which did not formulate any heresy, which did not make any dogmatic decision at all, but which was supposed to come to the aid of a false teacher, as "Räubershnode". In every solid church history, be it by Catholic or non-Catholic authors, everyone can easily orientate themselves about this fact. So historical reality has nothing to do with this assertion by R.

According to R., the doctrine of indulgences, which was developed with a lot of effort and legal acumen by Tertullian, who was born around 160 AD and died in the High Ulter in the course of the 3rd century, is in truth like everyone else's knows, who is more thoroughly familiar with church history, only developed in the Middle Ages from the church's doctrine of penance, and zivar with the strong involvement of Germanic ideas. So whoever not only judges, which every Catholic does, the abuses that occur in the handling of indulgences have occurred, but who wants to reject indulgence as such and in general, must direct his insults not against Tertullian, but against the Germanic customs of wergeld — and penance - the word means atonement and is of Germanic origin - because these are the human factors in the development of indifference from the early Christian handling of poenitentia - this word means repentance - Tertullian has nothing to do with it.

The Old and New Testament doctrine of creation and the holy name Sahbes, which means: I am the being, are too high to lose a word in defense of the ancient church and the church of all centuries, which have found this doctrine and this name may.

The greatness, both moral and spiritual, of Saint Augustine has been paid such unanimous homage by a millennium and a half in its noblest representatives that the expression "Scladic half-African" deserves further mention.

The passage Mt. 16, 18 (You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church) was not falsified either in antiquity or in the Middle Ages. It is understandable if non-Catholics try to interpret it differently than the Church does. In terms of text, the authenticity of the passage is indisputable. I let the Protestant Th. Zahn, who himself also gives an explanation that differs from the Catholic one, speak: "The claim that the Catholic zext of verse 18 was unknown in the entire 2nd century is more than bold. The Diatesseron (a Syriac compilation of the two Gospels, in which the same text was contained, the editor)... belongs to the 2nd century, and how would it be conceivable that such diverse witnesses as the author of the Flemish homilies, Tertullian (pud. 21; praescr. 22; monog. 8) and Origen would have persistently cited the Catholic text as the only one they knew, even if it had only emerged somewhere new during their lifetime. "In the Zat, the most outstanding non-Catholic researchers have the Fight against the authenticity of Mt. 16, 18 also abandoned.

Finally, what about the ascetic exercises described so frighteningly by R. As far as this is concerned, there was no saint "Cusäbius" at all, bon, Macarius R. would probably have to say which one he means, because there are several saints with this name. Presumably he or his unnamed source means Macarius of Mexandria, also called Macarius the Younger, about whom the Historia Lausiaca tells us that he atoned for several months, whether it was an impure pleasure, or whether it was killing an insect that he considered to be rash, the manuscripts differ - by atoning for the stings he suffered from fatigue R. would have to describe the "pious nuns" more precisely so that we could check the matter.

A saint There is Hilarius, who was Archbishop of Arles in the 5th most — century - he was a fine, highly educated man - and another, the well-known, who was Bishop of Boitiers in the 4th century. He was the pioneer of the faith against the Urians known from the Council of Nicaea, he was also a highly educated man and the son of a native family. Using his life to prove the error claimed by R. S. 185 (that he only lived in rubbish) would be, I would almost say, more than impossible.

The source of the information compiled by R. is probably nothing other than the infamous Pfaffenspiegel, the well-known, sad machinations of hatred of the church, which was spread en masse among the people by the enemies of the church, especially in the past by the communists. From the nature of The dependency is clear from the list, although it may be an open question as to whether the Pfaffenspiegel has directly or indirectly become the basis for the depiction of R. In any case, it has undergone a not inconsiderable transformation along the way; it's not even that bad in the Pfaffenspiegel. About there can be a murkier source?s

By the way, it is not too difficult to compile strange facts from the lives of the pious Orientals, and I certainly do not think of including all the affective exercises of the Egyptian monks, I mean those of which real history knows, not just the imagination. to be described as exemplary or even just worthy of recognition. The Egyptian national character is not ours. This is why St. Benedict, as much as he admired the Egyptian monks for their holy zeal, created a rule for the West that breathes a completely different spirit. If one studies the features of Egyptian monasticism, whether they are legendary or have been handed down credibly, with a historical sense, something completely different comes out than in R., also with regard to the undoubtedly exaggerated and unhealthy things that exist alongside the genuinely heroic ones and internally healthy.

Finally, let us now ask the question of whether, quite apart from the suppression of all the infinitely good, great and noble things that can be said about the ancient church, R.'s picture is correct in just one place the answer is: not even in a single place!!

The church of the Middle Ages

A. The picture at R.

Let's move on to the Middle Ages. For R. "there is no question that even without the intervention of armed Roman-Herrian Christianity (among the Germanic peoples) the mythological age came to an end" (p. 155). If further development was undisturbed, so He thinks that among them "natural symbolism" would have given way to "a new moral metaphysical system, a new form of belief," namely one that "had the idea of honor as its leitmotif." Unfortunately, through Christianity, another spiritual value "penetrated into them" and claimed the first place: love, in the sense of humility, mercy, submissiveness and asřese. Today it is clear to every sincere German that with this all creatures "The doctrine of love that encompasses the world equally, a sensitive blow has been struck against the Geele of Nordic Europe" (p. 155).

Now it is significant that the idea of Love is especially in the management of the church institutions "Where it could, it is (R. means the "Roman system") with excommunication, contempt, Borrowed fire, sword and poison. Let's see from fitt-legal evaluations completely and only represent this fact firmly, which even from modern Roman Catholics writers is not denied" (p. 156).

So, to pick just this one passage, we can name the one guiding idea that dominates R.'s depiction of the Middle Ages. A second, which always recurs, is the view of a counterpoint of the doctrine of a transcendent, supra-eternal God forced upon the Germanic peoples to the supposedly Germanic knowledge of the mere world law as the ultimate meaning of being. To quote a passage: "This Nordic-Western idea of a sequence of events in space based on laws, the study of this reality, is not only not an idea in itself that every Mongol, Shriner and African also falls for should, but quite the opposite: this idea (which appeared in a different form in Nordic Hellas) faced the fiercest opposition of the many foreign races and their world views for thousands of years. The idea of inner-being and self-being was a slap in the face to all views that based their world view on the arbitrary tyranny of one or many beings equipped with building power.

built. A science of ours could no more grow out of a world view such as that which the old, fundamental Jehovah imparted to us than it could out of the belief in demons and evolutionary hypotheses of African people. The struggle of the Roman ecclesiastical system against Germanic science arose from this eternally alien opposition. This took its brilliant course through streams of blood shed by Rome. Pious Nordic monks, who placed more value on the bending of the world-absorbing eye than on yellowed shrian bergaments, were persecuted with poison, kerfer and dagger (see Roger Bacon, see Scotus Erigena)... Like Apollo to Dionysus, so are Kopers - Nikus, Kant, Goethe to Augustine, Boniface VIII, Pius IX. opposite. Just as maenadism and phallic customs sought to disintegrate ancient Greek culture, so Etruscan doctrines of hell and witchcraft madness pervaded every movement of Nordic world knowledge. With the story of Jesus expelling the evil spirits from the swine, this Syrian magic was attached to Christianity to this day; From then on, hell and ascension, hellfire and hellish torment became Christian science, the succubi and incubi established scientific doctrines, and it was not logical that Rome finally published the books that professed Copernicus' heliocentric teaching in 1827 (!!) from the index dash)" (pp. 120-122).

The claim of poison as a Roman weapon of war often recurs: "The greatest achievement in its history (of Nordic man) was the Germanic realization that nature cannot be controlled by magic (as the Near East thinks it can do), but not could be mastered through intellectual schemes (as later Greece did), but only through the most intimate observation of nature. Here the pious Albrecht von Bollstedt comes close to Goethe, the enthusiast Francis to the skeptic Leonardo. The Germanic West did not allow the Roman Church to rob it of this vitalism, despite excommunications, poison and funeral pyres... This is how Germanic science once became the greatest parable in the midst of an army of 9 million murdered Kessians the inner freedom of design has been given to us" (pp. 141 to 142). It is said of Lode Meister Eckarts: "Whether (he) died a natural death or through assistance with a little powder remains unknown" (p. 254).

All details are related to these basic views.

The pagan Germanic tribes and also those who became Arian enjoy R.s Sympathy; but Catholicism can bring nothing but evil. We read:

"The ancient Goths tolerated - as Döllinger testifies - so-

probably the Catholic as well as another faith and showed reverence for this spiritual need for faith as such. What disappeared everywhere where the spirit of Boniface and the compulsion of love triumphed"... "Compare, for example, the attitude of the pagan Frisian king Radbod in contrast to the Roman will to persecute... , who sent Christian preachers back with all honors to Pippin, the Duke of the Franks. This is what Alcuin reports." (p. 156). We find out

how R. thinks Christianization occurred when it says that "the blood-based customs of Nordic people and their knightly way of thinking could not be completely driven out even with fire and sword" (p. 163). We read about what survived : "From Wotan comes St. Martin, since Wotan's cloak, sword and horse are emblems. "The Leufelinne, Venus" transforms into St. Pelagia, Donar becomes Peter worshiping the heavens, also St. George and St. Michael are renamings of Old Nordic images." -"Even the pious Hrabanus Maurus, the most learned church doctor in Germany at the end of the 8th century, allows God to live in the castle of heaven, an idea that does not come from the Bible, but from old Germanic hero's soul comes" (p. 163). We learn from Odin that he went to St. Oswald, from the same that he went to St. The sorrow of that legendary, joyful saint is that, according to the Edda, Odin, wounded by a spear, hung on a wind-swept tree for nine nights (pp. 164-65). "But the feast days of the Christian church came on the same days as the Urbolt celebrated them, whether this was the feast of the fertility goddess Ostara, which became the festival of the resurrection, or the feast of the winter solstice, which became the birthday of Jesus."

Nevertheless, if someone thinks that there is room for every national color in the church, then that is of course a reversal of all the facts that are only too clear. From Boniface to Louis the Pious, who eradicates everything Germanic with bluntness and style A single attempt to enforce an inexorable... uniform faith (unitarianism), a form, a forced belief system, a language and a rite uniform for the nine million burnt heretics, continues up to the Vatican Council and to this day Nordic people, Levantines, Niggers, Chinese and Eskimos. (Compare the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in 1926, where Nigger bishops celebrated Mass." (p. 167.) We are always

reading new things about the suppression of the national in the Church, which the historian is amazed at, e.g. B. "The pious, but unchurched movement of the Beguines and Begards (forest [chüler)...was like one outside and inside the church wide river through the German lands. She grabbed boron above all, a basic feature of the destroyed Arianism

on: teaching the religion in the national language... Gregor VII had described it as impertinent to use the local language during church services. The real popular feeling rejected the foreign Latin language, which was seen as an incomprehensible Bauber formula to be parroted and was used as such. Around the middle of the 13th century, the religious German movement wrested the use of the Holy German mother tongue from anti-people Rome. Sermons and teaching lectures were now not spoken in Latin, but rather in the heartfelt German... Today the Catholic priests also preach in German, but the entire liturgy, the sayings and also the songs and the prayer formulas must be part of our simple people still muttering in Latin... Whether the Tibetan turns his prayer wheel or a German farmer prays in Latin, there is fundamentally no difference" (G. 255-56). And when it says on p. 291 Unm. that In the churches of Spain the liturgy was Visigothic as late as the 11th century", we are apparently supposed to learn from this that the Gothic language was preserved in the liturgy from Arian influence in Spain. Therefore,

for R. the religious struggles are just variations on the theme: Germanicism is fought by the church, especially the Cathars (p. 88) and the Waldensians (p. 89 ff.) in the Middle Ages. For R. it is as clear that the Cathars represent Germanic blood in southern France, as is the fact that Waldes was a Germanic. According to him, Petrus Waldes is a great, mysterious personality... who immigrated to this city (Lyon) (as yet unknown from where), Peter by name, who later received the name Valdo or Waldes... he always felt more the gap between the simple gospel and the exuberant behavior of the church; he then felt ever more deeply the paralyzing effect of the compulsory religious doctrine. And in the true belief that he was serving the spiritual leader, Peter Waldes made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he demanded simplicity of morals, honor in actions, freedom of thought about the Gospel... They wanted to grant him many things, but not the essentials. Then Waldes distributed his fortune, divorced his wife and explained to the representative of Rome who wanted to force him to recant: One must obey God more than people. This was the birth of a great heretic and great reformer to whom all Europeans - including all Catholics - have every reason to be grateful. The great size of the Peter Forest must have had a tremendous impact on the formation of the community of the poor in Chon, the successes of his travels to the Rhine, to Bohemia, the emergence of Waldensian communities in Ben-

tral Austria, in Pomerania, in Brandenburg show that his demand for evangelical freedom of teaching brought an ancient Germanic spirit to fruition, took firm root in the souls and could no longer be eradicated: the same demand, the prayers of Bruhs, Heinrich of Cluny, Arnold of Brescia also raised. The Mainz sculpture shows us Waldes as a purely Nordic head: a skull like that of the ancient Germanic tribes, a strong, high forehead, large eyes, etc. (pp. 89-90).

What the church brings to the Germanic Middle Ages is, in R.'s depiction, something pernicious, mean, and shameful. We have already pointed out above that, according to him, the idea of witches and the belief in magic are Etruscan heritage, which the Pope, the "Etruscan Haruspex", passed on to the Middle Ages.

Worse still, it is the Pope's terrible nature that he has to act like this: "The medicine man (meaning the Pope) as a demonic figure has no more need for independent thinking from his followers than for honor-conscious actions. In order to secure his position, he must consequently strive to eliminate one and the other with all the means at his disposal. He must cultivate all too human fears and hysterical tendencies. He has to preach witchcraft and demon magic. He must use index, fire and sword to prevent all research that could lead to a different result or even to liberation from the entire worldview taught by the medicine man. The medicine man must throw a Roger Bacon into the dungeon just as he would a Gallilei. He must be careful and explain the value of Copernicus and strive to destroy all thought systems that want to assert honor, duty and loyalty to men - all teachings tailored to high-quality personality - as life-shaping powers.

Describing the attempt to impose the medicine man's magical, demonic world view on world politics means writing Roman dogma and church history" (p. 173 f.) The blocking (bold) by R.)

On p. 619 we read about a similar example that illustrates this policy in the early days of Christianity in Bahern: "The church labeled every slain missionary a martyr and named him a saint. Even when the Roman Jew Emmeram raped the Bavarian Duke's daughter and was therefore killed by the Bavarians, the infallible Church declared this ignominious end as a death for the faith. Today Emmeram is a saint who is worshiped in pious Regensburg."

In this policy "Pope Hadrian I lied to Charles the Elder. Gr. with the claim that this (meaning the so-called Constantinian) theory

'kung' is in the Vatican archives, and the Frankish king, blinded by the Orient, fundamentally recognized the supremacy of the Roman bishop" (p. 523 f.), with an omission explaining in more detail: "An exact compilation of all the forgeries would be extremely instructive - gen on which the claims of the Roman Church are based. In addition to the infamous Constantinian donation, the forgery of the minutes of the church assembly of Nicaea should be mentioned here, according to which the primacy of the Roman bishop was presented as existing from time immemorial ; also the falsified authentic 'martyr stories', over 500 at the Bahl; the falsifications of the conversion and baptism of Constantine the Great; the alleged 'Detret of the Emperor Gratian'; pseudo-khrill etc. In short, almost all of them are original 'Certified claims of the Roman Church are based on forged documents." (p. 524, note)

After R. has extensively described the so-called saeculum obscurum of the papacy, the 10th century, he remarks that "these conditions , are wisely ignored by a historiography that is on the one hand deceptive and on the other hand cowardly" and then says of Germany in the Ottonian period: " The first cultural centers in Quedlinburg, Reichenau and Hersfeld were built and founded by the emperor, not the pope. On the contrary, the popes had honorable advocates murdered, such as Hadrian VI, who ordered the king of Brescia to be strangled and burned when he heard of his penitential sermons" (p. 193). In a note it says: "I cannot go into more details here. Just note"... What follows is a series of information about the Renaissance popes' alleged income from immoral sources, which we will discuss further below.

Immediately afterwards, R. shows strong aspirations for a Germanic national church of their own as early as the Middle Ages: "Otto I's aspirations were undoubtedly based on the idea of a Germanic national church, which seemed to have died with the sunken Arian Goths. For this reason he determined that the clergy should be appointed by the landlord. But this also caused him to submit the papacy to himself: in 965 the Romans had to swear not to elect a pope without the emperor's consent. Otto III et- self-importantly named two popes. Henry III cleaned up in a similar way. the papacy. In the great conflict between Archbishop Willigis of Mainz against Roman peopleless centralism, all German bishops found themselves in conscious open rejection of the Pope, who finally had to give in. People were even freer in Germany back then than in 1870 and 1930!" (p. 193 f.)

Just as the Empire fought against the Papacy for a Germanic national church, so the German episcopate, in alliance with the Empire, fought against the Un-Germanic monasticism that had fallen under the control of the Papacy:

"However, the baptism was greatly strengthened by the Clunhazens, who wanted to create an international organization that was dependent only on the pope, going beyond the state framework. Although this movement set itself the goal of reforming the dilapidated monastic system, it soon revealed its un-Germanic mentality. The hitherto customary penitential exercises against the sinful devilish flesh, at which the Germanic had laughed and looked down, were stripped of their previous clumsy form and transformed into a more cunning torture of the soul (as a forerunner of Jesuitism, so to speak). For certain parts of the Clunhazen monastery there was a strict rule of silence, all cheerfulness was forbidden and friendship was not tolerated. Showing off was made a pious duty, and those guilty were given dishonorable punishments. This unnatural form of breeding apparently comes from the Ligurian-Eastern race, which existed before the immigration of the Nordics, among others. also settled southern France. This trampling of one's own soul, this inner self-emasculatation and desire to submit to foreign demons and building powers shows us the spirit of the Roman Church in the closest, racially determined interaction with all Hungarian blood and shattered population groups. It is therefore no coincidence that the Clunhazen reform immediately gained a foothold in the eastern racial lines of Lorraine. Archbishop Aribo of Mainz immediately took action against this mental illness and supported the power-conscious Conrad II. In the north, the old blood stirred almost at the same time: Bishop Adalbert von Wettin set his goal of a Germanic national church. The word "German" became common knowledge for the first time, and monks of the Roman Church now looked after the remaining, almost destroyed spiritual resources of their people" (p. 194 f.).

It is impossible to cite here everything that R. wrote in passing from the Middle Ages. But no one who has read R.'s book will certainly accuse us of the fact that what we offer here shows darker shadows in the picture of the Christian Middle Ages than in R. himself. On the contrary, it is quite impossible to even begin to convey, through a selection, the correct idea of the accumulation of all accusations against the medieval church and of the limitless ubiquity of R. before it. Wherever he senses the Church at play, everything is evil, the knight's shivertive marriage (. 189) as much as the crazy crusades" (p. 190), in which "the unchanging politics of the Roman Church" ... "through mesmerizing sermons" "rivers of blood were shed for the domineering church." And if the above

If different nations had their own battle troops in the crusade, Rome could not prevent this; but by playing off different interests against each other, it was able to sow 3wietrant.

And to this day he has considered this his life's work. Rome, out of self-preservation, can transfer a people's and honor-conscious state, much less an entire honor-conscious, self-confident nation, which is why it must sow war and promote racial disintegration. This is in the nature of his raceless system and will not change as long as this system exists (p. 190 f. Blocking bold by R.).

But this, *Ceterum censeo Ecclesiam esse delendam* R., should not prevent us from going back to the scientific examination of his work in a calm and objective manner.

B. Exam

We will not address the question of the Germanic Geele's alleged opposition to the Christian doctrine of a transcendent God, a creator of the world and a holy world ruler. The teaching of the Germanic peoples about Christianity and more than a thousand and a half years of history have already refuted this error. But what about the persecution of thinking minds through poison, daggers, kerfers, etc., which R. speaks about so emphatically, naming names. We would rather not take the "yellowed Greek parchments" too literally; besides, it would be a testament to high education if the monks were really able to study yellowed Syrian bergaments. Also the small mix-up in the passage Mt. We would like to let 8.32 pass, but what about the poisoning or stabbing of Scotus Eriugena and Roger Bacon by the papacy, about which science has not yet known?

Johannes Scotus Eriugena, as the name suggests, an Irishman by birth and education, lived since around 850 in the trousers of Charles the Bald, the grandson of Charlemagne and ruler of the Western Frankish Empire. He translated from Greek the writings of the so-called Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, a Christian Neoplatonic Graeco-writer from around 500, and also adopted some of his Neoplatonic ideas himself. As a highly respected scholar, he outlived Charles the Bald, who died in 877, but how long is not known, and as a respected scholar, he also died peacefully, most likely in the West Frankish Empire.

Where is his murder? We allow ourselves to give the explanation. In the 12th century, a legend from the English monastery of Malmesbury, named Johannes, was said to have been murdered by monastery students who were embittered by his strictness, a legend that has long been recognized as completely unhistorical. In Malmesbury, however, she was temporarily brought together with Johannes Scotus Eriugena, which is as unhistorical as it has long been rejected as such. It's easy to even think about it

already orientate themselves in a larger scientific lexicon. However, poison, dagger and baptism? Both the lexicon and all literature say this.

And Roger Bacon? Roger Bacon, honored as Doctor mirabilis by the Church of the Middle Ages, was an Englishman, born around 1214, a student at the universities of Oxford and Paris, became a Franciscan and as such one of the greatest lights of high scholasticism. His strength lay in the area of empiricism, the science of experience, which he proved particularly in the biblical textual literature and especially in physical investigations and discoveries. Since he came from astronomy to a type of astrology, to a belief in the influence of the stars on the body and soul of man, his superiors feared the accusation of superstition and hindered his work through fearful restrictions. Pope Clement IV, to whom Bacon gave his *Opus majus*, *Opus minus* and the so-called *Opus tertium*, appeared as a shooter for him. Clement IV ensured that the scholar's full creative freedom was restored, and he worked at the universities of Dresden and Paris. When, ten years later, concerns about his supposed magic were raised again about him, his fearful order general, Jerome of Ascoli, sentenced him to monastic imprisonment, i.e. H. Seclusion in the Paris monastery. But then he became Pope himself, as Nicholas IV, and gave Bacon back his teaching position in Oxford, before the latter died in 1294 and found his grave in the Franciscan church. This can also be stated more simply in any scientifically serious lexicon.

Finally Master Edart! It is unknown whether he died from poison

"It's going to be hard to keep calm here. Because it

It is well known that Master Edart, who was commanded by his brothers, loved and highly honored, died in the peace of his monastery in Cologne in 1327.

I don't remember a single one anywhere in all the literature

to have found the slightest insignificance of another death. The sub-

The claim that Edart was poisoned is absolutely outrageous!

About Copernicus and Galileo? Although these two only belong to modern times, their matter has already been discussed here. Nicholas Copernicus, canon in Frauenburg (1473 to 1543), to whom we owe the breakthrough in the knowledge of the heliocentric world system, as is well known, continued ideas in this system with better reasons that had come before him in Italy and also in Germany, here through the Cardinal Nicholas of Cues was represented. When he laid out the basic principles of his teaching in 1531, he encountered violent opposition from the reformers, a contradiction that was subjectively excusable because they believed that the Holy Scripture was contradicted by this teaching. Luther declared him a fool (Erlanger Edition Vol. 62, p. 319), and Melanchthon rejected him no less (cf. *Corpus reformatorum* 13, 216). The Catholic learned circles, on the other hand, applauded him, and when Copernicus l. 3. In 1543 he presented his scientifically completed system to the world; in the work *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* he dedicated it to none other than Pope Paul III. The Nuremberg publisher, with what Luther's statement shows was not unjustified caution, added a preface in which the system was described as a "new and wonderful hypothesis". Pope Paul III accepted the dedication; with Catholic bishops and with The work was accompanied by cardinals

started recording. Precisely as a result of the battles with the reformers of the faith, whose zeal in keeping the Holy Scriptures was not inferior, people in Rome were more anxious in the following century. So it was famous that the great physicist and astronomer Galileo Galilei, when he broke the Copernican system with new reasons in his *Sidereus Nuncius* in 1610, initially received support from Pope Paul V and the cardinals, especially Cardinal Barberini, the subsequent Pope Urban VIII., was received enthusiastically, but in 1616 attacks by several overzealous religious against him because he contradicted the Holy Scriptures made an impression on the Sacrum Officium and Galileo was forced by it to recognize the condemnation of his teaching. It was only in connection with this that the book of Copernicus mentioned above was "suspended" "*donec corrigatur*", i.e. H., until it has been improved, or more precisely, until the heliocentric system is explained in it only as a hypothesis, not as a reality. However, as further advances in astronomy, especially through Newton's discoveries, provided compelling evidence for the correctness of the Copernican system, there was no resistance to the new research, and i. l. In 1757 the Index Congregation expressly decided to lift the ban on books that denied the earth's standstill and claimed that it revolves around the sun. The book of Copernicus is therefore also deleted from the 1758 index. Unfortunately, for formalistic reasons, Galileo's previously indexed writing did not disappear from the index at the time, but only in the new edition of 1835, although the teaching had already been officially released in 1757, and after previously approved books in Rome had already taught the system had. The case of Galileo is well known to every educated Catholic. Not an infallible teaching of the Church, but rather a very regrettable error of judgment by a Roman authority. In 1616, Galileo, and only then with him Copernicus, were hit by Galileo, but without astronomical science on its path to progress to stop this, which found its most enthusiastic representatives in religious circles, including in Rome and the Jesuit order. In the light of history, the matter looks essentially different than in R.

Let's go back to the Middle Ages. It is well known that the Arian Goths tolerated the Catholic faith, but apart from what was also evident elsewhere, the generally moderate and noble character of the Goths is very understandable, since they were only a very small minority in the peoples they subjugated. Tolerance is mutual. On the other hand, it would be wrong to believe that Arianism was the source of tolerance. During their rule in Latin Africa (429-534), the Arian Vandals proved themselves almost continuously as brigands and at times as cruel persecutors of the Catholics, a fact that is so historically established and known in detail that only complete foreignness in it this matter can lead you to write something else.

The information about the Frisian King Rabbod comes, as R. correctly states, from *bon Ulfuin*, namely from *Alfuin's Life of St. Willibrord* c. 11. What R. does not specify, however, is the beginning of this very chapter 11 of the *Vitas*, where it says that Radbod was killed because of the running of three people in the Holy. The source of the island of Helgoland caused great anger by Willibrord, who had been blown there by the storm

fell against the priest of the living God and intended to "avenge the insult of the gods", so that Radbod, according to his custom, cast lots three times over three days for Willibrord and his companions, but it never fell on them, except for one of the three companions, who was then also killed by Radbod. But Willibrord, "who had been much scolded by Radbod because he had left the shrines and insulted his God," approached him with such great apostolic courage that the king did not dare lay hands on him. However, he couldn't allow himself to do anything to his powerful neighbor, the Franconian landlord; He even tried to get on good terms with him by giving his daughter Cheudsind to Pippin's son, Grimoald, as his wife.

With regard to the survival of the pagan-Germanic language in Christianity, which in itself is to a certain extent self-evident and is not denied by anyone, R. unfortunately records the picture as a whole, and he is wrong in all the examples. St. Martin's cloak and schivert come from the life story written by Martin's student Sulpicius Severus c. 3, ivo it expressly states that one day at the city gate of Amiens an inadequately dressed beggar begged Martin, who was then still an officer in the Roman army, and that Martin therefore took away his 30g schivert with which he was girded, his coat cut it in the middle and gave one half to the Urmen." Saint Pelagia, as can be seen from the research of H. Delehahe, has nothing to do with Venus. For Christianity, St. Peter is never a "guardian of heaven ", but he lives in the popular imagination as the gatekeeper of heaven, but not through a transformation of Donar, but because people thought of the word of Christ, who gives him the keys to the kingdom of heaven. St. George is a saint whose veneration as the patron saint of fighters and whose legend, along with his popularity, came to us from the Greek Church. St. Michael is not the renaming of a "Nordic image" (what does that mean, by the way?), but his image was formed after the Apocalypse Chapter XII, 7: And there was a great battle in heaven: Michael and his angels fought with them the dragon. St. Oswald is a well-known historical figure, King of Northumbria, died in 642, nothing less than the transformed !Odin, even if features from Odin's imagination were later incorporated into his legend. The so-called St . KÜmmernis has nothing at all to do with Odin, but owes its existence to the misinterpretation of a crucifix in Lucca that was already well known and revered in the early Middle Ages and on which the Savior is depicted wearing a long zunika, as G. Schnürer has conclusively demonstrated. If Hrabani^v Taitis , 3ivar speaks of the castle of heaven not at the end of the 8th century, as R. says, but in the 9th century (Hraban was probably born around 784 and died in 856) where, R. doesn't say, that's an expression, which we often find in the early Christian Roman world, especially on tombstones. Easter did not receive its day from the gesture of Ostara, and only in a limited part of the areas of German origin did it receive its name; but without any fluctuation the lag is always determined before the Sunday after the first full moon of spring, because also the day the resurrection of Christ fell on such a Sunday. The festival of

The winter solstice has just become the birthday of Christ, at least not in the sense of R.; Because in the southern countries, where December 25th was first celebrated as Christ's birthday, Solniven was not a popular festival. The exact day — in Rome, December 25th, considered *Natalis solis invicti* — may well have contributed to the fixation of a specific day to commemorate the birth of the Lord, the sun of eternity, since there was no tradition of its date. But that is completely different than what R. says.

The fact that "Ludwig the Pious tried to eradicate everything Germanic tooth and nail" is a big mistake, which is not helped by the fact that it is often repeated today. How does his contemporary Thegan describe him? "He had a moderately tall figure, tall, bright Eyes, an open face, a long straight nose, lips that were neither too thin nor too thick, a strong chest, broad shoulders, very strong arms, so that no one could equal him in archery or lance throwing. Is this an un-Germanic weakling? Now when Thegan as a clergyman - he was choir bishop of Trier - following his praise of Ludwig's knowledge of the Holy Scripture, he emphasizes that he despised the pagan songs (*carmina poetica gentilia*) that he had learned in his youth and did not read them, nor wanted to hear, nor wanted to teach" (c. 19), then one cannot really base the accusation on this. Saß that he tried to eradicate everything Germanic root and branch. Because these few words are exactly that. The only basis for the entire accusation. Presumably, by the '*carmina poetica gentilia*', Thegan means nothing other than Latin poems that were impressed upon the boy during lessons in the Latin language. This is supported by the reference to reading and teaching. Thegan himself should have thought of German songs with mythological content or the like, so Ludwig could still be a good German even if he later no longer enjoyed these songs. Now even to connect the 9 million burnt heresies with Ludvig's lack of joy in the *carmina poetica gentilia* is a bit of a stretch, not to mention the number, about which interesting things can be read below.

The translation of the Begarden as "forest students" is a novelty. Even stranger is R.'s idea of their relationship to a "basic feature of Arianism" with regard to the German language and of the role of the German language in the Church of the Middle Ages in general. In what language are the missionaries and clergy supposed to have taught the people? But of course in the local language. The Latin got sour enough for most of them. Religion has never been preached or taught to the people in a foreign language. R. seems to mean in all seriousness that not only in the past, but even today, the Catholic farmer prays in Latin. Not a word should be said about such an idea. The liturgy, i.e. H. the language of the priest at Holy Mass is Latin and always was in the West, including the Visigothic language, which R., in his ignorance of the history of the liturgy, apparently considers to be a remnant of the Arian liturgy, while it is nothing other than the Latin, Roman Catholic liturgy from the time of the Visigothic Empire and the subsequent subordination of most of Spa

nies under Arab rule. So everything and anything in R.'s book contradicts the findings of science.

In the treatment of the Keßer persecutions that R., as we have seen have to take up a wide space, he has a double aim

Herbor, to portray the Kessians as persecuted Germanic peoples and the persecution as the result of a bloodthirsty persecutory will that was necessarily native to the church against the Germanic concept

of Christianity. How are things? Where and as long as religion exists purely as such and is not jointly responsible for the state and public cultural life, it is natural and easy that it knows no other means than purely spiritual means of asserting itself. Therefore, the ancient church, which had experienced the abuse of power on itself, rejected violence in matters of faith. Lactantius therefore writes in his *Institutiones divinae* (Religious Instructions) i. 3. 308: "Religion is a matter of free will; . . . You cannot impose it on someone by force. If you (he means the persecutors of Christians) want to defend the religion with bloodshed, with torment, then you are not defending it, but rather defiling and hurting it" (Book V c. 20). Uber yes Constantine, who had not yet been baptized, but as a Roman Caesar, like his pagan predecessors, felt entitled and obliged to concern himself with the religious order, said to the bishops of the Council of Nicaea: "You are the bishops (the word *episcopus* actually means overseer of internal things; but I am appointed by God to be bishop of external things" (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* V, 24). In this sense, his sons tried to help Arianism achieve victory in the church using state violence. The Arian bishops, in alliance with the state, oppressed the Nicene faith. Hilary of Poitiers his voice: "I ask you, by what means did the apostles spread the gospel? What power did they rely on to preach Christ? Today, alas, earthly gunfire stands behind the faith, Christ's power is no longer valid" (*Contra Auxentium* c. 4). Even though the emperors banned immoral pagan cults and ultimately helped the decline of belief in gods by prohibiting sacrifices, it was But the private confession of paganism, as we saw earlier, was spared by them. Violent measures, however, came into question against the Manichaeans and the Donatists. Manichaeism was a pagan, extremely dualistic system that arose in Persia in the 3rd century spread in a strange mixed form into the Christian empire areas. Since it viewed humans physically as creatures of the evil primal spirit, it pushed for an accelerated return of the parts of light trapped in the soul through the extinction of humanity. Hence their fight against the Che. In I. 287, Diocletian had punished them with death as enemies of human order, and the leaders with the extreme punishment of burning. Laws of the Christian emperors of the 5th century took up this law, albeit in a milder form, in that not confession, but only external activity was punished, and this itself generally only resulted in banishment, etc. were punished. The Donatists, a social-revolutionary group that emerged in Latin Africa at the beginning of the 4th century, resorted to violence from the very beginning and thus initiated reprisals. The bishops of North Africa

were divided in their attitude towards them: some welcomed the strict measures taken by the state, others, especially St. Augustine, in whose support the military was still strong, initially rejected all military action and finally opposed the violent excesses of the Donatists recommend the "temperata severitas", i.e., in the highest case, fines or banishment (Augustine, Epist. 93, 10).

The idea now is that the state with *temperata severitas* is at risk of believers being allowed to intervene brought about *deus* in the world that had become Christian Middle Ages through. By the 11th century it was more moderated than been sharpened. The German tribes are not with the spirit of hatred, the R. in such an absolutely unfounded way to St. Boniface, in truth a man of the finest and most tactful love, ascribes, has been commanded, but all without violence, in free submission to the gospel, all, say, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Bavarians, the Thuringians, the Angles Saxony, the North Germanic people, with the sole exception of the Saxons who lived in There was a border war with the Franks for centuries, until Charlemagne subjugated them and forced them to accept Christianity. You then have in 10th and 12th centuries their own flatvian neighbors in the area between The Weser and Elbe were no less hard hit. The church itself is until 11th century managed without any use of violence.

This changed in the course of the 11th century as a result of the forced transplantation of Manichaeian tribes to the lower Danube ordered by the Byzantine emperors, from where Manichaeism, with its old dualism, with its rejection of marriage and the doctrine of the evil primal spirit as the creator of the Leiber spread to Germany, Italy, France and even Spain. This was so-called Catharism. If it had penetrated, it would have meant the overthrow of the entire Christian European culture in the Lat. The fact that it spread underground in the form of secret sects only made Catharism all the more sinister to contemporaries. That is why when it first occurs we find such a strong reaction from the population and the secular authorities. We know the individual cases quite well because they caused a stir and were recorded by the chroniclers: the first was the execution of 13 Cathars on 1 1022 in Orléans on the orders of King Robert, namely by burning (*regis jussu universae plebis consensu*; Radulphus Glaber, *Francorum historiae* III, 8); 1052 in Goslar on the orders of Emperor Heinrich III. by hanging (*Imperator... quosdam haereticos... consensu omnium in patibulo suspendi jussit*, Herimannus Augiensis, *Chronicon ad a. 1052*). Accused Cathars were repeatedly snatched away by the people from the religious authorities, who still disapproved of such violence in those years, and were, as we would say today, lynched, for example in 1076 and 1077 in Cambrai, Flemish, then German, which Pope Gregory VII attributed a serious charge, as in 1114 in Soissons, where the people, "fearing clerical good-naturedness," as the contemporary source says (Wibert von Nogent, *De vita sua* I, 15), tore the Cathars out of prison and burned them, so on This time in Cologne. Peter von Bruhs, whom R. (p. 90) mentions, was thrown by the bitter people into the fire that he himself had prepared from broken crosses in order to cook meat in it on Good Friday.

The case of Arnold of Brescia, which R. mentions several times, is completely different. Not because of his penitential sermons, attended by Pope Eugene III, the disciple of St. Bernard, would have taken offense, just as little as Hadrian IV (not Hadrian VI, as R. says twice, in the text and in the register!), who, incidentally, was a Nordic pope, an Englishman, he came to Lode. But because, despite his promise to Pope Eugene III to keep calm, he tried to regain political power in Rome, proclaimed the right of the Roman people to make the German emperor, and Frederick Barbarossa to elect a new one. When the emperor threatened him, he had him captured and handed over to the city prefect of Rome, who, according to Barbarossa's verdict, killed him by hanging. Otto von Freising, Frederick I's uncle, says expressly in his actions of Frederick I, the *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*, after sarcastically castigating the presumptuous behavior of the Romans driven by Arnold: "Since he did this and similar things for a long time, namely driven by the death of Celestine (1144) until then (1155)...., he was finally captured in the Tuscan region, reserved for the judgment of the emperor (!) (*reservatus*) and finally hanged by the city prefect, and after he was burned at a stake "The ash was scattered into the Tiber so that the frenzied people would not be able to worship his body" (lib. II, c. 28).

It's just like this: the executions of heretics that took place in the 11th and 12th centuries did not come from the church, but were the people's justice and the state's justice. Wazo, the bishop of Liège, a leading representative of the reform, whose ideas had the greatest influence on Gregory VII, protested sharply against the execution in Goslar that we have just mentioned (*Vita Vasonis*, c. 25 p. .); he doesn't want any other measure against them. Kezer as expulsion from the church. But

the persistence with which the Cathar movement maintained itself, yes spread, the measures against them became more severe in the 12th century; At the end of the 12th century, some French bishops also took part in judgments that sent the Cathars to death. Seen from the perspective of the times, the first very strict measures taken by the popes are understandable: Lucius III. In agreement with Frederick I in Verona in 1184, he decreed that the stubborn heretics should be handed over to the secular arm; Frederick I, for his part, imposed the Imperial Eight on them, a very harsh punishment because it included banishment, confiscation of goods, incapacity for employment and destruction of the houses. At the beginning of the 13th century, the power of the Cathars rose to heights, especially in southern France and northern Italy. You only understand the seriousness of the situation when you consider the following. The dualistic doctrine of the wickedness of the body was definitely the guiding principle. Therefore, Che, even the legitimate one, was the greatest sin in their eyes. The woman, who was pregnant, was considered to be covered in dirt; If she died during this time, she was lost forever. Therefore, it was necessary, sooner or later in life, to receive the *consolamentum*, the baptism of the Spirit, after receiving which marital intercourse would be viewed as an unpunishable crime. Those who had received the *consolamentum*, which also imposed fasting obligations, were the perfect ones, the spiritual bearers. Those who are

could not rise so high, postponed the reception until a serious illness, which gave rise to fears of Lod. But so that they could not heal ettva and then break their vow, it was common practice that sick people voluntarily allowed themselves to starve after receiving the consolamentum entiveder, or that their relatives, either of their own accord or under the pressure of the perfect ones, deprived them of food and thus caused them to die, even among children! Döllinger is probably right in estimating the number of deaths from voluntary and involuntary starvation to be far higher than the number of victims of the Inquisition. It was assumed that the imperfect people went through a soul migration through people or animals until they were given the opportunity for consolamentum. Hence the absolute ban on killing animals or eating animal food. Like the body, the civil constitution is also evil. Hence the absolute ban on military service, the ban on the oath of loyalty, which meant nothing other than the complete negation of the existing civil and feudal order. The Cathars were really serious about the idea that the worst thing of all would be to continue to banish souls into evil bodies by producing children. They had to renounce Catholic teaching and its cult in the strongest possible terms. Now they not only accused the church of upholding the Che and the sacraments, since the consolamentum was the only thing for them, but also - and this understandably made — an impression - the high and powerful position of the bishops and prelates, their possession, their intimate Connection with the celestial power. In doing so, they touched on a chord that was struck again and again in the religious and inner minds of medieval people: the contrast between the poverty of Christ and the apostles and the splendid position of the representatives of the church. The influx of the people was based on this, and also, where rivalries between secular and spiritual lords were involved, the support of the nobility. This contrast often gave rise to a subjectively well-intentioned inwardness, simplicity and sacrificial power among the Cathars.

Two comments must be made here if one wants to understand the situation. First: What is the so often lamented wealth and worldliness of the medieval church? Were the clergy generally rich? No, he was poor, quite poor. This was the so-called lower level, the pastoral worker. But above him stood the higher clergy, i.e. H. the bishops and many of the chapters. But the positions of the higher clergy were generally entirely in the hands of the nobility. The feudal system of the Middle Ages reserved for itself what was meaningful, influential and profitable in the church. However, the feudal system is of Germanic origin. So if we accuse - and the Cathars have already done so - the princes of the church because of their ostentatious, Christ-unlike nature, we must not forget that this great system, which is truly disastrous in its consequences, does not come from the old tradition of the Church comes, but was the dark underside of the Germanic aristocratic order, which was so brilliant in many respects. Ziveitens: The connection between church and state was so close in the Middle Ages - the state also demanded from the church the ecclesiastical consequences of the state's ban - that it is almost self-evident that a movement like that of the Cathars

Church and state were fought together, and it is understandable, even if it is regrettable, that even the harshest measures of the state were accepted by the church.

This happened when the surprising spread of Catharism in southern France, after the attempt at amicable means had failed to achieve its goal, resulted in the great Albigensian War (1209-29) and at the same time the Hohenstaufen Frederick II, as a ruler of thoroughgoing, merciful power, was present - loose energy and based on Roman law, renewing, i. l. 1224 ordered the burning of the stubborn heretics for Lombardy instead of the previously milder procedure of the eight. With the burning, he simultaneously adopted the popular procedure that came from the Germanic folk tradition and was originally used against builders, which we learned above, and the punishment of the old Roman law against the Manichaeans. Unfortunately, the Pope at the same time, Gregory IX, a man of the strictest professional zeal to the point of harshness, came up with the imperial law i. l. 1230 only too willingly accepted for Rome. The Church has every reason to mourn that the two indomitable rulers who would later meet as enemies, the Hohenstaufen Emperor and the Pope, met in the face of the still feared Catharism and one strengthened the other. Frederick also issued the law of 1224 for Sicily in 1231, for the entire German Empire in 1232, and especially for Arles and Vienne in 1238. Frederick had declared heresy to be a *crimen laesae majestatis*, a transgression of majesty. That is how it remained, subject to the terrible punishment of Lodes. The church took it upon itself to ensure that no heresy arose or, if it did appear, that finding the guilty, converting them if possible, and then imposing severe ecclesiastical fines, but handing over the invincible to the state arm, so that it deals with them according to state laws. That was the inquisition (investigation of faith). . Externally, the traditional basic saying was maintained: *Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*: it only examined the facts of heresy. But it not only gave free rein to the state law, which it knew, but expected, and in certain cases has they particularly urged that the secular authorities take action. From a higher perspective, it was a great misfortune that Frederick II and Gregory IX joined forces in the fight against heretics and that a procedure was introduced for centuries that, although in... The heresy might be eradicated at the moment, but on the whole it could only do harm to the Church and Christianity. However, people live in their time, and the 13th century and the period that followed considered it right and necessary to do what disgusts us today.

Nothing could be more wrong than to see the fight against Catharism as a fight against Germanism. Catharism was an Asian import via the Byzantine Empire. A Greek named Niketas emerged as the supreme leader of the Cathars at the Cathar Council held near Toulouse in 1167.

Armed service and loyalty were just as abominable to them as a healthy Church with children's blessing. Where is the Germanic that R. finds in them supposed to be?

For the non-Germanic and socially threatening character of the Cathar faith, I also cite the testimony of the non-fatholic historian of the Inquisition, H. Ch., who was even very biased against the church.

Lea: "That was the belief that spread rapidly in the south Europe filled the church with well-founded terror. How much so do we may curse the means used to oppress him, and how much we pity those who, for the sake of their conscience So we suffered, we can't help but admit that the cause of the Orthodoxy in this case with the cause of civilization and progress agreed. If Catharism had become dominant, or would one have If he were even granted equal rights, his influence would diminish have proven unfailingly to be disastrous. No Uskese regarding this Sexual intercourse, if carried out strictly, necessarily led to ruin of the human race. But since it is a contradiction If the saying went against nature, she would probably be more likely to do so rampant confubinate and the destruction of the legitimate che caused, as the human race is destroyed and the banished soul becomes its creator have returned to what the true Cathar sees as the highest happiness seemed. Furthermore, by examining the visible universe and everything else in general, material as the work of Satan and rejected it, the Katerians made tharer makes all striving for human perfection a sin, and people would have to conscientiously adhere to such a belief must lead back to a state of original wildness over time. So Catharism was not just a rebellion against the church, but also a sacrifice of nature. In this sense he became also looked at from the beginning, and we can only be surprised that he is "It was particularly disastrous that the treatment of the Cathars became normative for the treatment of heretics in general. The Waldensians, who also appeared in southern France in the 12th century, were of a completely different breed. However, R. says of them is full of historical inaccuracies. It is not true that Peter Waldes was of Germanic origin, that he immigrated to Lhon as a mysterious stranger, that he was a merchant in Chon; that — he was later given the surname Valdo, that was more the case — his common name; that he found the forced religious teachings difficult - there is no mention of this in the sources and there is no content for it in the circumstances that he demanded or asked for freedom of thought, nothing would have been further from a simple medieval person's desire to have him recant wanted to force, and that he had predicted in the manner stated in bon R., that he had come to Germany, to the Rhine and to Bohemia and lived there - he never thought of it. And should his head be in Mainz?

The real situation is like this: Waldes was, presumably i. 3. 1176, so moved by the ideal of apostolic poverty that he gave away his wealth to the poor and soon, with others who followed his example, founded a brotherhood for the realization of poverty. Before long, the "new poor" begin to preach, i.e. as the Anonhsm of Laon, the best source available to us, says, "sua et aliena culpare peccata". 6. h. to accuse them of their sins and those of other people. At the 3rd Lateran Council, which concluded the peace agreement between Barbarossa and the great Pope Mexander III. Sealed in 1179, Waldes seeks confirmation of his

Brotherhood after. He receives them without restrictions with regard to the poverty ideal, but with regard to the sermon with the limitation to the moral sermon, since as non-priests and uneducated people they should not be allowed to preach the faith, and in subordination to the religious clergy. This is exactly how it is later with St. Francis, who showed great kinship with Waldes in his early days and probably absorbed his ideas not without the influence of the movement influenced by Waldes. If Waldes, like Francis later, had limited himself to preaching morals in subordination to the responsible representatives of the church, he would probably live on today among the great men of the church, if not even among its saints. But since after a short time he did not adhere to the ordered restrictions, the bishop of Chon forbade him and his comrades from preaching, and since they did not respect this ban, he placed them under an anathema and brought about their ban and banishment in 1184 on the Shnode of Verona, already mentioned above, on which Pope Lucius III. and Barbarossa dealt with the order of church relations. Waldes then formed a secret counter-church, together with a line of a Brotherhood of Humiliates in Lombardy, specifically Milan, which insisted on similar ideas. But since the Italian supporters did not want to submit in everything to the leadership of the forest, which wanted to rule and ruled as *praepositus et pontifex omnium*, a break occurred as early as 1210, and after the *Голѣ бѣз* Waldes in 1217, the separation between the Italians remained and French Waldensians. Some of the Humiliates did not go along with the separation from the church; Pope Innocent III confirmed it as an order in 1201. The French branch continued to exist, steadily declining, as a secret counter-church within the Catholic Church, whose services it took part in, until the 14th century. The Italian branch, however, developed great activity and propaganda, even beyond Italy's borders, to Germany, Poland, Bohemia and Hungary and to the Alpine valleys of Sabohen. The great persecution of the Savoyard Waldenses in 1545, whose cruelty is abhorred by all historians, whether Protestant or Catholic, was carried out by Jean d'Oppède, President of the Parliament of Vix, on behalf of Francis I of France, the ally of the German Protestants against the emperor after the Waldensians had allied themselves with the Calvinists in 1532 and had therefore appeared more dangerous in the eyes of the prince than before. Catholics also have great respect for the Waldensians' loyalty to their beliefs and their endurance of centuries of persecution. But history knows nothing of any special Germanic element among them either. About the 9 million murdered heretics! History knows nothing of this fantastic number of executed heretics. Where does she come from? In the book by M. Kemmerich, *Kulturkuriosa* 1st vol., (6th-7th thousand o. l.) p. 70, written for Freidenfer propaganda and made up of anti-Christian and anti-church anecdotes and erotica, I find the information that Voltaire calculated in his work "Dieu et les hommes" that during the heyday of the papacy, 10 million people fell victim to the "Mother Church". H. St. Chamberlain refers to the basics of the nineteenth century I, p. 452 (I use the first edition from 1899)

to the same writing by Voltaire, but in which he writes of the "ten millions who have been slaughtered by or for Christianity" or in the comment that "Voltaire in his work Dieu et les hommes gives a detailed calculation according to which ten million people would have fallen as victims of Christian church teaching", with the reproach that Voltaire had reduced the numbers considerably, sometimes to half, in order not to be accused of exaggeration.

So Voltaire is certainly the source for R, directly or indirectly. Let's look at Voltaire's calculation. It can be found in the 42nd chapter "De Jésus et des meurtres commis en son nom" of his work "Dieu et les hommes" (Oeuvres complètes, vol. 30, Paris 1819, p. 322 ff.). In the article I give exactly the individual sentences by summarizing Voltaire's attached text, which is often quite long and mocking. It follows from this that Voltaire not only made a hateful but also a historically nonsensical calculation. There are the alleged 2,000,000 victims of all the wars of the 16th and 18th centuries. Century, including the War of the Spanish Succession, the War of Robbery of Louis But even Voltaire put the victims of the Inquisition, who actually only come into question as the "convicts murdered by the church", at 200,000, and those of the killed Waldensians at 18,000, which is quite a long way from the 9 million R.s δοῖν προῖ . Here is the list:

1. Schism of Novatus in Carthage and Novatianus in Rome, as the alleged cause of the Christian persecution. d. Decius, their victim	200
2. Heathens killed by Christians in the Diofletian version	
Consequence	200
3. Victims of the Donatist riots	400
4. Victims of the migration caused by the Arian-Catholic Contrast was caused (!!)	300 000
5. Victim of the image dispute	60 000
6. By the Byzantine Empress Theodota βετ Γοβε over-delivered Manichaeans	120 000
7. Occasionally announce bishop elections during unrest	20 000
8. Crusades	1 000 000
9. Victims of the German conquest of the Baltic countries	100 000
10. Keger Wars in Southern France.	100 000
11. Papal Crusades against the Emperors	50 000
12. Lote in the Great Schism	50 000
13. Zote in the Hussite Wars.	150 000
14. Waldenser	18,000
15. War victims of the 16th-18th centuries century	2 000 000
16. Victims of the Inquisition	200 000
17. Victims of the Spanish conquest of Umerifa	5 000 000
18. Victims of the Japanese war, for which the Jesuits were responsible (V. means the Japanese persecutions of Christians!!).	300 000

Total 9468800

The whole thing is a pattern of historical nonsense and blind anti-Christian fanaticism. Since we are not dealing with Voltaire here, I will avoid discussing the individual items. This is how the "9 million burned Kessers" are created!

The researchers who have dealt scientifically with the Inquisition, including the above-mentioned Lea, Hansen and Vacandard, have refrained from coming up with boring total figures. But if you look at the numbers of individual inquisition tribunals that can be determined historically, for example: B. Lea-cites the statistics of the inquisitor Bernard Guidonis, who worked at the Inquisition Court of Pamiers in southern France from 1308-23, who handled 636 cases, of which only 40 were referred to the secular arm, the others with lesser, sometimes very light punishments went out, and adds (I, 533): "This table can probably be viewed as a fairly accurate measure of the frequency of the various common punishments." The list can be found correctly printed in Vacandard, *L'Inquisition* p. 322, according to which the total number of cases treated is 930, i.e. less than the 20th part that ended with the transfer to the secular arm for execution. Vacandard can also state the ratio of the cases treated to the transfer to the secular arm for the Toulouse court. It was 22: 1. It must be remembered that the inquisition proceedings were concentrated in certain areas and certain areas, while in other areas and for long periods of time there may not have been a single case. Although the number of heretics consigned to death with the cooperation of the Church remains deeply painful for us, it is still, as Vacandard rightly observes, far removed from the phantoms which are only too readily created by the magnifying pen of poorly informed compilers "(ibid. p. 237), who don't care about multiplying the numbers by 100 or more. How could R. rely on such compilers"?

If things look completely different than R. believes in terms of the larger historical context, the lack of criticism becomes even more obvious when one examines the details. We mentioned the claim regarding St. Emmeram. Now that he is worshiped in pious Regensburg is a strange derailment. Every Catholic school child knows very well that only God is worshiped, but the saints are venerated. That is also the case in pious Regensburg! But the Roman Jew and the rapist of the Duke of Bahern's daughter? With the "Roman Jew" R. really once fell victim to the Jews. Because Haimhram, as the saint was called, Emmeram is just a Latinization of it, is an original German name and means house raven. Haimhram was a Franconian. During the humanist era, when the name was not understood, a resourceful person came up with the idea of associating it with Amram, the name of the father of Moses (Exod. VI, 18), and the Regensburg Jews were happy to do so to adopt this declaration as your own. But historical science has long since laughed at this craziness of the idea. 12 As far as the Vita is concerned, in which Bishop Arbeo of Freising tells us the legend of the saint, historians agree that it is such that it is difficult , a reliable one

Peel out the core. This legendary vita makes Haimhram a bishop of Poitiers, who gives up his diocese, moves east, is held by the Duke of the Bahern in order to consolidate Christianity in Bahern. Then after several years he wants to move on to Rome. Before the meeting, Duke Lochter confided to him that she had had sinful intercourse with the son of a Bavarian great, which had not gone without consequences, and both of them, in danger of being discovered, threw themselves desperately at the saint's feet. In order to save her life, he allows the Duke's Lochter to call him, the innocent, the child's father, sets off for Rome, but is caught by one of the king's sons and murdered in the most horrific way. Albert Haud, the best expert on German church history among the Bro testants, rightly says (in the article "Emmeram" of the prot. Realenchflopädie V 339): "A completely unsolved mystery, on the other hand, is the reason for his murder. Because that of Aribo There can hardly be any doubt that the story told is a free invention." So what remains of R.'s information? Nothing!

The other historical details are no better. He does not say which source R. fell victim to with the claim about Pope Gregory VII's innovation about church services in the local language. In any case, another misjudgment 13. The source regarding Pope Hadrian I is no less incorrect. To name a recognized Protestant scholar, I refer to H. Böhmer, who in his detailed article on the Donation of Constantine in the Realencyclopedia f. protest. Theol. (XI, 1-7) writes that with regard to the question of whether Hadrian L. in a letter to Charles the Elder. Gr. from the year 778 "alludes to the donation", zivar a sentence in which he mentions Pope Constantine and Pope Silvester, seems to presuppose the existence of the document, whereas the following sentences would have to lead to the opposite opinion, and emphasizes that in Rome never referred to the document in the 9th or 10th centuries. "Only two Frankish popes, Gregory V and Gerbert, the second Sylvester, made use of it... 14. Then it remained for another half century forgotten, and only a Frankish pope, Leo IX, snatched them from oblivion for the second time, but he used them in the dispute with Byzantium. The most it could have been was that Hadrian had the donation in mind and indirectly alluded to it; but that too is almost impossible. Furthermore, the following should be noted about the "Donation of Constantine," which every Catholic handbook of church history provides information about.

It was probably created in the second half of the 8th century, during the time of Rome's distress at the hands of the Lombards and its neglect by the Byzantines. In terms of content, it is an extension of the so-called New Year's Eve legend, i.e. H., a legend that was widespread at the time, including in the Christian East, according to which Constantine was cleansed of the testimony during the baptism given to him by Pope Silvester. It was now added that in gratitude the emperor had moved his residence to Byzantium, away from Rome, that he had allowed the Pope to use the insignia of the empire and had given him Rome, all the provinces, areas and cities of Italy and the West. It will certainly be used first in the so-called

Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries that arose not in Rome, but in Gaul, against the exaggeration of the power of the metropolitans in the 9th century. Outstanding historians also want to point the origins of the Constantine donation there. Nevertheless, like most Catholic historians, we would like to choose Rome as the place where it was written. As is well known, once she became credible, she played a small role. Their inauthenticity, however, was exposed as early as the 15th century by Cardinal Nicolaus of Cues, St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the later Pope Pius II, and the humanist Lorenzo Valla.

The "Minutes of the Church Meeting of Nicaea"

(according to an earlier remark by R. that council at which the monks, those who could not read and write did teaching saws; a bread roll

It seems that they have written and read skills after all) unfortunately does not exist;

We would be infinitely happy if such etivas existed. In reality, it acts

These are the so-called "canones", i.e. the summary resolutions of Nicaea, which have come down to us in their original Greek version (from which, by the way, we already had to talk about above). The 6th Ka-

Non of this council deals with the order of the larger ecclesiastical Districts: "The old tradition should remain in leghpten, in Libhen and the Pentapolis, namely the bishop of Alexandria takes over the jurisdiction have all these provinces, as this also belongs to the Bishop of Rome.

Likewise in Antioch and in the other eparchies the churches should have their traditional rights are preserved. It is very clear that if someone is a bishop Verden wanted, without the consent of the metropolitan, the council ordered him, to renounce his episcopate. But if someone has been elected with good deliberation and according to the laws of the church, and only two or three are opposed to him out of a spirit of contradiction, then the vote of the majority counts 15".

The canon therefore wants the superior position of the bishops of Mexico,

Antioch and others, fart the religious order paused to know the pattern of Rome. In the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon

451, which was about whether the position of the patriarchs of

Mexandria and Antioch towards the newly ascended patriarch

of Constantinople should remain in force, the papal legate Paschasinus gave the contents of the canon in Latin as follows: Quod Ecclesia romana

semper habit primatum; teneat autem et Aegyptus, ut episcopus Alexandriae omnium habeat potestatem, quoniam et romano episcopo haec est consuetudo, d. H., so: that the Roman Church always has priority

has had; but the Egyptians also kept it, so that the bishop of Alexandria has power over all (communities), as this also applies to the Roman

"The order of the bishop is traditional." The order of the

Patriarchal districts should therefore remain in force, including in relation to Constantinople.

This is the alleged forgery of the Protocol of Nicaea. The

combination with Alexandria and Untiochia in particular shows that the legate was concerned with maintaining tradition and upholding existing relationships of precedence; Whether the precedence of bon Rome etiva went further than that of Alexandria and Untiochia is revealed in the contents of the canon, the Greek text of which the council participants all had at hand

or could have easily, so that the attempt at a forgery would have been completely pointless, not said. As much as there is a scientific discussion about this canon, it concerns the meaning of the primacy mentioned in it and the summary heading given above.

The authentic martyr stories are falsified together, over 500 in number! Firstly, the martyr stories have as much to do with "certified demands of the Roman Church" as the history of the Seven Years' War has to do with the Constitution of Athens. Secondly, there are many more than 500 martyr stories. Scholars would have an easy job if there weren't more than 500 to sift through for literary and historical criticism. Thirdly, the edition and critical study of the stories of the martyrs is an undertaking in which Catholic and non-Catholic scholars of the highest rank work together in a friendly manner, and neither of these nor of those thinks of it as genuine, i.e. authentic ones, which exist in quite a few places, and not to confuse authentic, legendary ones, and fourthly, martyr legends cannot be described as forgeries any more than one would call the German heroic legends as fake because they are not historically correct¹⁶.

The alleged Defret of the Emperor Gratian is a discovery that legal historians will be happy about. Emperor Gratian reigned from 357 to 383. The *Decretum Gratiani*, which is inaccurately called in abbreviation, is a collection of Camaldolese religious law sources. monk Gratianus from the 12th century. Its actual title is: *Concordantia discordantium canonum*, i.e. it wants ecclesiastical legal regulations of earlier times, which naturally, since they were issued under very different circumstances and for different nations, through scientific treatment. As a result, this monk became the father of canon law, well known to science, but not a Roman emperor.

The name "Pseudo-Chrillus" refers to a partially inauthentic collection of sayings by Eastern fathers and councils on the position of the Pope in the Church, created around the middle of the 13th century, which was intended to help reduce the Greek clergy's aversion to The fact that Urban IV, to whom it was handed over, viewed it as genuine in good faith is also emphasized by Dollinger, to whose *Janus*, or the revision of *Janus* by I. B. Friedrich, the information given by R. is probably indirectly based (Friedrich, p. 132), but also that it was learned Dominicans of the 17th/18th centuries who already disputed its authenticity¹⁷.

But so-called *saeculum obscurum*, i.e. H. the 10th century, whose conditions in Rome are by no means "wisely concealed by a historiography that is on the one hand lying and on the other cowardly," but has always been treated by old and new Catholic historians with the same openness and indignation, R. unfortunately notes Not that a very large part of the blame falls on the excessive influence that savage noble families had acquired on the papal chair. Unfortunately, these noble families were of good German blood. Stephen VI, who committed the well-known shameful death on the corpse of the Pope -

stes Formosus committed was a creature of the Counts of Spoleto, illegitimate descendants of the Farolingian family, and his act was a display of Spoletan power politics. The main figure of the 10th century in Rome is Count Alberich of Spoleto, whose German name should have made one cautious in exploiting the abuses of the 10th century. The unworthy John XII, to whom R. refers, was Mberich's son and was handed over to the Romans by him.

The presentation of the secular rulers as the true and only founders of culture and intellectual life in general is completely wrong, both in their overall view and in the details cited as evidence. The founder of Reichenau was not Otto I, but St. 200 years before him. Pirmin, a Spanish or Aquitanian missionary. Likewise, the founding of Hersfeld etivas has nothing to do with Otto. Its founder was none other than St., who was treated so unkindly by R. Boniface in connection with his disciple Sturm.

It is a very strange claim that Otto I stipulated that the clergy would be appointed by the landlord, even in order to found a German national church. Otto never thought of the latter, and as far as the former is concerned, it is apparently from the so-called own church system, i.e. H. distant news reached R. about the arrangement in which the landlord appointed the clergyman for the church built on his land. According to the latest research, the private church system existed for centuries under Otto, even on the large Roman estates, and was further de-divided in the Germanic empires, much to the detriment of the intellectual high status of the clergy. Under Charlemagne the church managed to repair the worst damage. Nevertheless, the Eigenkirchenwesen remained disastrous. And it explains a lot of things that are now made as an accusation against the Church of the Middle Ages¹⁸.

What follows with R. is again wrong. In 964, Otto made the Romans swear not to elect a pope without his consent. In a similar way, the Romans chose to join Otto III. the two excellent men designated by the emperor: Gregory V and Sylvester II. Henry III. but met Gregory VI as the valid Pope in 1046. an blameless man, and as an invalid, because he himself had already resigned before a Roman scandal in 1045, the unworthy Benedict IX, again an offspring of the Counts of Tusculum! So he only had to purify the papacy insofar as the power of the Zustulans was finally broken and popes from the then high-ranking German episcopate, the so-called German popes, came to the chair of Peter for a long time.

What then follows about the conflict between the civil and German bishops and the "boltless Roman centralism" is completely wrong. In the case of Willigis of Mainz it is a conflict with St. Bernward of Hildesheim, one of the noblest and greatest sons of Saxony Tribe, on the question of whether the Frauenloster Gandersheim, founded in 852 by Count Liudolf, the lord of the Ottonian imperial house, in the area of the diocese of Hildesheim, belonged to the Bishop of Hildesheim, or, as later, to a daughter of Otto II wished to join the monastery, which was subordinate to that of Mainz. In the long-drawn-out matter, the German bishops and the German

The Emperor together with the Pope on the side of the Saxon Bishop against Willigis. This is exactly what A. Haud, the aforementioned Protestant author of church history in Germany, presented in detail (III, 268 ff.).

Eb. Aribo of Mainz (1021-31) was a friend of the monks, including the Cluniacs. The outdated error, which the Protestant Hauck just quoted also rejects, of seeing Aribo as an opponent of the Cluniac reform, is based on the fact that an inadmissible interpretation was given to the decisions of a provincial synod that took place under Uribo's chairmanship in Seligenstadt in 1023. At it, among many other things, it was decided with regard to an appeal by Count Otto von Hammerstein in his case to the Pope that a person sentenced to church penance would only be allowed to appeal to Rome after completing his penance and would have to take a letter from his bishop with him there. Hauck rightly says that it is wrong to conclude from this determination of the Synode, which is based on a concrete case, that Aribo's position is anti-papal, and even to turn this into an anti-Cluniac attitude, not to mention things that R. is looking for here. How Uribo "supported the power-conscious Conrad II" would probably be impossible for him to explain. History certainly knows that Uribo was embarrassingly surprised when Conrad, without taking him, the metropolitan, into his confidence, called the bishop Achezo of Worms, and that he was even more dissatisfied with Conrad when he refuted the Mainz objections to Gandersheim in Frankfurt in 1027 and also secured Gandersheim for Hildesheim at the King's Day in Pöhlde in 1028, this time finally and forever (cf. Hauck a. a. D. p. 547 ff.) So wherever you look, the opposite of what R. hastily picked up from the literature he used is always true.

This was also the case with Adalbert of Bremen. Adalbert, in 1043 by Henry III. promoted to the archiepiscopal see of Hamburg-Bremen, stood out from the ranks of German bishops in that he had Greek blood in his veins and boasted of it, and therefore also enjoyed imitating Greek customs and customs" (Haud, p. 650). "He also believed in the power of the secret art, and the long line of German princes who allowed themselves to be deceived by goldmakers is opened by him. His goldmaker was a baptized Jew named Paulus" (ibid.). With the Nordic blood in him, things are not entirely perfect. I characterize him further with the words of Haud: "This bizarre flaw in his nature increased with age: he turned day into night and night into situation. His speeches became more and more boastful and arrogant. His future pictures become more and more elaborate. His whole being became more and more restless. He seemed to be bordering on insanity. The result of these factors was the most unmeasured ambition..." (p. 656). In this context, he also has the certainly laudable idea of a very large undertaking to continue teaching the Nordic peoples about their pagan gods and the Blat, Hamburg became an ecclesiastical patriarchy for the Pogbep zi tachen. The goal was not a Germanic national church, but rather the spread of Roman Christianity among the Nordic peoples and the establishment of a patriarchate subordinate to Rome in Hamburg.

What remains is the "dissolute monasticism," which Cluny set out to reform before it revealed its true, evil Glee. The decline of the monasteries, which Cluny tried to control, consisted above all in the fact that the old bad custom of forgiveness of the monastery to secular favorites of the rulers (the system of lay abbots, related to the private church system), which had already accommodated many monasteries in Merovingian and Carolingian times, was torn down again, that in others the reservation of entry by nobles, the So they sought their supplies there, darkened the actual life of religious life. In addition, there was destruction during the invasions of the Normans and the Huns. So we cannot speak of a decline in monasticism, but rather of the invasion of some monasteries by extra-monastic powers. Therefore, even where these powers were not at work, in the 10th and 11th centuries, the heyday of Cluny, we also find other flourishing abbeys, whose intellectual excellence is still impressively visible to us today in the works of art created in them at that time. In order to remain faithful with the Archdiocese of Cologne, St. Pantaleon, whose building still stands before us today in noble splendor and simplicity, and St. Martin, in M.-Gladbach St. Vitus, also Brauweiler and Siegburg, flourished in Cologne, in Trier St. Maximin, whose most magnificent manuscripts come from those locations, in Hildesheim St. Michael and St. Godehard, whose noble churches are the unmissable beer of the city, etc. All these buildings and their art treasures are works of the "rosy monasticism" of that time.

What is said about the Cluniacs in general is just as wrong. 19. When Cluny was founded (910), it was precisely the time of decline so luridly described by R of the papacy, the *saeculum obscurum*. Putting oneself at the disposal of this papacy was something that no one in Cluny thought of. The idea would have been completely out of date. Cluny was well placed to protect some monasteries from the threat of damage caused by the selfish interventions of secular or spiritual greats To ban discipline, exterminate episcopal power and place it directly under Rome. They always had a particularly good relationship with the German emperors, even with those who were very high-handed towards the papacy, such as Henry III. The further information about penance in Cluny is completely above. Strict life and silence are the basic law of all priestly life; it has raised strong, masculine characters.

With R. you are faced with errors at every turn. If he e.g. B. p. 226 in the long note from a sermon by Berthold of Regensburg, which he unfortunately does not specify in more detail, reads "pure Syrian building work" because Berthold speaks here of the priests' power of absolution, it can hardly be anything else sermon, than that of the seven sacraments. (In the edition by F. Göbel, which is available to me, Schaffhausen 1850, vol. I, p. 310 ff.) There you can find (p. 327) the in R. quoted passage mostly verbatim, but with very significant differences. R. quotes: "Whoever submits himself to the behavior of the priests, no matter how great his sins may have been, - the priest has the power to immediately punish him Hell closes and heaven opens." But Berthold says: "Whoever submits to the priest's power with honest confession and with true repentance, the priest has the power to give him

immediately close hell and empty heaven with true repentance according to the grace of God and the situation of man." Why are the words in bold missing from R.?

Again we have to ask: Is the image that R. devises of the church in the Middle Ages correct? Is there even one of all the things mentioned here that has been shown to be historically correct? We have to answer: not even a single one! And where do we find a word from the great one in the Middle Ages? For him, the Crusades were "crazy" undertakings that only had the effect of "shedding rivers of blood for the domineering church" (p. 190). He doesn't know that they really shot the West before the Orient, Europe before Asia. In order to ask these great German questions, where is there a word about the German colonization of the East by the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, where is there a word about securing the German Middle and East in general, without the connection of the German monarchy with the church never happened and would never have been possible? What about the positive meaning of the Christian imperial idea, which, despite later visualizations, actually became the root of Germany's world significance? Where anything about our great saints, not to mention the great saints of other Christian countries? And should one really believe that the unique cathedrals of the Middle Ages and all those other immortal artistic works of sculpture, painting and poetry blossomed from a swamp? The surest evidence of what is innermost and most precious of an era is its art, because art is naive and essentially honest, a faithful bender. They are still there, the stone witnesses of the Middle Ages. The church and its spirit brought them into being, and anyone who is not familiar enough with the sources of history to form an independent judgment from them would at least find them to be of the greatness of the ecclesiastical Middle Ages.

The church of modern times

A. The picture at R.

Let us finally take a look at the history of the church in modern times. It goes without saying that the mistakes of the Renaissance popes are not kept secret. But we learn some surprising things in addition to what is known to science. In connection with the *saeculum obscurum*, the 10th century, R. says: "I cannot go into more details here. It should only be noted that the popes had certain percentages paid to them by the whorehouses, which Paul II (1464-71) turned into a constant source of income. Sixtus IV received 20,000 gold ducats from the brothels. The priests had to pay certain taxes for their concubines, while the Vatican paid its officials with checks on the brothels. Sixtus IV also permitted boyish love for a certain payment. Innocent VIII had 16 children to feed. Alexander VI but declared that the Pope was higher than the king, just as man is higher than cattle. That's probably why he had a dozen bishops and cardinals who seemed dangerous to him murdered. Pope Alexander VI eliminated the Turkish pretender to the throne Dschem for 30,000 gold ducats and calmly collected the money from the infidel Sultan. In 1501 Alexander VI appointed his daughter Lufrezia for a contribution to his deputy" (pp. 193 to 194). We then learn about the "cadaver obedience of the Jesuits" (p. 177), on the "shy moral theology of Saint Alfonso by Liguori", which, together with "the dishonor caused by Jesuitism, meant that since the strangulation of the religion of the master Edart, everything really great in European culture has arisen from an anti-church spirit, by Dante, who was expressly condemned in 1864, among others, because he had described Rome as a sewer, and Giotto to Copernicus and Luther, not to mention German classical art and Nordic painting and music." Because "Rome is determined by lower races and at the same time ossifies" (pp. 196-197).

We read a particularly instructive example of this lower racial condition on p. 383 f., also as an artistic expression of the "swamp fulcrum", i.e. of "motherhood", of "widespread general sexual intercourse", of "female domination" of the "Nordic Culture often only surrounded by Etruscan centers", the rotunda is mentioned and the struggle of the Nordic principle with the principle of the swamp fulcrum of the Etruscans, which here, however, is described as "mother-worshipping"

of the Urbolt", the "separation of the basilica and the central principle of church building" is presented. We hear that the basilical principle is the Nordic one, that the central building comes from the Etruscan house formed by marsh reeds arranged all around, and that therefore "the domed building of the original St. Peter, the Bramante, was given a basilic edge, this idea of the old round house idea also shows how St. Stefano Rotondo or Maria della Salute" (pp. 383-384). So St. Peter is also exposed as Etruscan, albeit at the price of turning the architectural history on its head.

We also hear that "the thirty bloody years were still not enough for Pope Innocence on January 18, 1874 in a gathering of international pilgrims: Bismarck is the snake of the paradise of humanity. Through this snake the German people are being seduced into wanting to be more than God...that is what this empire will be for "Just as the tower of Babel was built as God's baggage train, it will be turned into rubble and passed over to the glory of God" (p. 471).

„Pius XI's policy is entirely consistent. clearly under the sign of a new Counter-Reformation, whipping up all the instincts of the Inquisition, in order to break Germanic Germany forever... No German Catholic today can ignore the terrible realization that the purposeful, unsentimental Roman politics joined forces with Marxist subhumanism and all of Germany's external enemies to complete what had not yet been fully achieved in November 1918. In order to achieve this goal, Roman politics also sacrificed the existence and life of the entire current Catholic generation in order to force the subsequent corrupted heirs of all Germans under their control" (p. 476 f.).

The history of the Huguenots takes up a lot of space (pp. 95-104). We are taught that the "head of the murdered Admiral Coligny was sent to the Holy Father in Rome, which resulted in a celebration of joy in Castel Sant'Angelo" (p. 101), and that the Huguenots "unwaveringly demanded freedom of conscience and doctrine "(p. 98), according to the context in the sense of freedom of belief for all, of which Coligny himself should be an example in that he not only demanded freedom of belief for himself, but also granted it to the Catholics of Chatillon." (p. 98) It is self-evident for R. that the Huguenots were the Nordic element of France. About Pope Bius V "called for ever new shedding of blood... He combined his congratulations (after the victory of Jarnac and 6er Tode Condés) with the order,

"To exterminate all kegs, including prisoners" (p. 100). He apparently acted from the same spirit in which the papal legate Meander (where and when is not stated): "We Romans will ensure that you Germans slain one another and in your bloody city." Yes, "this word is as valid today as it was 400 years ago (p. 620).

More recently, the picture has been further enriched by the fact that in the Enzhclifa, Casti connubii "the Vatican has once again confessed itself as the bitter enemy of the breeding of the valuable and the shot-in-arms of the preservation and reproduction of the inferior." (p. 577), finally, that "today the Roman priest still has to take an oath at his inauguration, which means nothing other than a conscious incitement to denominational and class hatred. Furthermore, it actually means the recognition of treasonous activity if the state does not serve Roman interests. Today the Roman bishop's oath still reads: "I will persecute and combat to the best of my ability the false teachers, those separated from the apostolic see, the rebels against our Lord and his successor." R. therefore demands: "A German state has one like this On the contrary, he has to impose an oath on all clergy to protect the honor of the nation, as was previously the oath on the monarch, in some states on the constitution, otherwise it becomes the main task of the German Order to strive in the service of the myth of the nation by creating a German people's church until a second master Edehart once embodies, lives, and forms the tension Töft, and this German community of souls" (p. 608).

According to R., this is what the history of the Catholic Church looks like. "It goes without saying that a Roman history denies all its falsifications; it is also logical that it condemns all genuine nationalism; at most it can only use it now and then as a means to certain ends; The fact that Luther was a vile scoundrel is taken for granted by Roman teachers in all states" (p. 626).

B. Exam

Let us take our time to examine this information. R. does not provide any source for details about the Renaissance popes. We have a book about papal finance in the 15th century by Adolf Gottlob, a specialist in this area: From the Camera Apostolica of the 15th Century (1889). There is no evidence of the Pope's income from Roman whorehouses. Nor any of the great histories of Rome and the popes, neither of the ones that were not at all friendly to the pope

Ferdinand Gregorobius History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages (3rd edition 1880), who deals with this period in the 7th volume, nor the history of the popes in the last four centuries by the even less pope-friendly Leopold von Ranke, who only came to power with Leo X. begins, but would probably have had the opportunity to mention these things in retrospect, etivas dabon, just to name books by non-Catholic researchers here. Regarding the remuneration of Vatikan officials, the claim is meaningless because of the entire organization of the papal civil service. Sixtus IV had, not so much his own interests, since he was a man of the greatest interest in science and art, but also a man of too much indulgence, than bitter enemies because of his nephews, who shamefully abused this indulgence, and the chronicler Stefano Infessura, in his diary della città di Roma collects everything that he believes he can pin on Sixtus, he knows nothing about these things. However, some of them can be found in the previously mentioned Pfaffenspiegel, i.e. the murkiest source that can exist, namely that of the alleged innovation of Alexander VI. concerning the kings, the murder of Prince Dshem, and also, without giving any figures, the murder of cardinals by Alexander VI. and his representation by Lucretia Borgia. We will go into more detail about them shortly. The story of Sixtus IV's 20,000 ducats in annual income from brothels could have been taken from the story of prostitution by Dufour-Helbing, a completely disordered and superficial compilation that only inadequately conceals its piquant character under the cloak of moral zeal. I will first go into this matter in more detail because it is instructive about how such historical fairy tales come about. Dufour-Helbing first mentions (vol. II, 1; 5th ed. n.d. page 4) a series of harsh measures that were issued by the popes of the 15th and 16th centuries to curb public morality, and in this context, that bad women were also barracked in Rome, and that "Sixtus IV is reported to have received 20,000 ducats from a brothel." He also cites his sources, namely: Georg. Franci, Tract. quo lupanaria ex principiis medicis improbantur, Heidelberg 1674, and Just. Lipsii, Opusc. tom. But if you look in the intended work of Justus Lipsius, the well-known Louvain scholar (1547-1606), Admiranda sive de Magnitudine Romana II. c. 6, there is a chapter there: De urinario vectigali et de Chrysargyria, item de meretricio, which reports on the above-mentioned unsavory things, especially on the utilization of the latrine contents in ancient Rome, and therefore has nothing at all to do with our matter. But if you are lucky enough to find the small doctoral dissertation that Georg Frand published in Heidelberg in 1674 as 'Disputatio medica qua lupanaria s. Hurenhäuser ex principiis medicis improbantur', you will find there an unfounded fact that Pontifex Romanus in fiscum suum annuatim ultra 3000 coronatorum per lactis censu quem vulgo dicunt milk interest seu whore's toll a clero scortisque accipit, ceu ex Joh. Gerhardo in loco de Ecclesia p. 1190 et B. Meisnero allegat Carpzov, prax. Crim. p. 29. 70 n.7. Carpzow, which the young doctor is writing out here, is the well-known one in Witten in 1595.

Berg, who died in Leipzig in 1666, is a notorious criminalist as the most terrible witch-burner, who in his *Practica criminalis* (I use the Leipzig 1695 edition) writes verbatim in the specified place what Frand copied from him. If you now look in the two sources given by Carpzov, I was unable to find a relevant passage in the *Loci theologici* of Superintendent Johannes Gerhard (1582-1637) in the section *De Ecclesia*. But if you look in the book by Balthasar Meisner (1587-1626), a Wittenberg theologian from the time of the sharpest religious polemics, which bears the title: *Consultatio catholica de fide Lutherana capessenda et Romana Papistica deserenda* (Wittenberg 1615), Finally, among all possible other accusations against the papacy, one also finds the claim adopted by Carpzov, albeit without citing the source, and also the claim that Sixtus IV gave a cardinal permission to sodomy. How reliable the good Meisnerus was when it comes to the outrages of the evil Papists can be seen, for example. B. also emerges from the fact that he says immediately after this matter that Pope Gregory - who of the fourteen *бес Патерс* that had already existed at that time - says that he did not find 6,000 children's corpses in a sign near a monastery! We see that these are horror stories from a turbulent time of struggle, which deserve just as much credence as those about the cut off hands of Belgian children, which were spread by the enemies in the world war against our German soldiers. One has to navigate such paths through the undergrowth of old literature in order to find the origin of the atrocity stories, which unfortunately
To be brought out again today.

Of course, it is far from our intention to want to cleanse the sins of the popes of the Renaissance period, who were truly wrong, at least of all Alexander VI, whom we Catholics have every reason to deeply detest as a desecration of the See Betri. Catholic church historiography doesn't even think about moor washing. The cases cited one should stick to historical reality. So we want to go to that by R. will therefore be discussed further insofar as they have anything to do with history.

Innocent VIII (1481-92), the son of a wealthy Genoese family, had lived as a layman at the court of the kings of Aragon and had two illegitimate children from this marriage. Since he later entered the clergy and rose up the ladder of honors to the cardinalate and finally to the papacy, nothing is known of any immoral lifestyle. The murder of the Turkish Prince Dshem is attributed to Alexander VI by some authors. been attributed, but cannot be historically held. Dschem was a younger brother of the Turkish Sultan Bajazet, who got into a dispute over the throne with his brother in 1482 and fled from him to the Knights of St. John on Rhodes. Since then he was first with the knights and finally with the Pope as a hostage against Bajazet in princely and honorable custody, while his brother, who had to fear his release, paid a high annual pension for his support and kept the peace with the Christians. Jem died as a result of his dissolute life; Alexander couldn't have done anything more unfavorable in his own interest than to have him killed.

Alexander is also unjustly accused of murdering bishops and cardinals. His illegitimate son Cesare Borgia, the king of Rome and Italy, did not shy away from this crime either. Alexander's representation by his daughter Lufretia is known; But it only consisted of the fact that, on occasion of her father's first trip to the nearby Castel Gandolfo on June 27, 1501, she received the authority to open the incoming letters and to manage the palace, the same again from September 25 to October 23 1501, when Alexander traveled to Nepi.

This was rightly perceived as scandalous even back then; But there can be no question of a representative in the sense of R..

It should be emphasized again: In the loathing of Alexander VI. Catholics agree with non-Catholics. Unfortunately, the example of Libav has been repeated several times in the church. One often has the impression that the opponents of the Church only know this one pope, or at least only the popes who are to be blamed, so that they can save themselves the trouble of studying the papacy in its other representatives.

The discovery that Bramante changed the planned rotunda of St. Peter's basilica is completely new. Bramante (1444-1514) designed the rotunda; This is precisely where Bramante's entire artistic ideal is expressed. A hundred years later, Taberna (1556-1629) converted it into a basilica. So the matter went exactly the opposite way, as R. states, and that is not entirely excusable for such a well-known and important work as St. Peter and for Bramante, the real master of the High Renaissance. The strange reference to the Etruscan swamp fultus probably does not require correction.

The "Cadaver Obedience of the Jesuits." In fact, the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus say that "whoever lives under obedience should allow himself to be directed and guided by Divine Providence through those above, as if he were a corpse that has come here and has it carried and laid there in every way, or as if it were the old man's staff, serving the one who holds it, two and as he pleases"; but it is also said in the same place that the purpose of this obedience is "to become more conformity to the first and highest rule of all good will, which is eternal goodness and wisdom" (Constitutions III, 1, 2,3; Summarium 21), and it is added more than once that obedience ends where the subordinate realizes that what is demanded would be a sin. Perhaps today, in the time of new national discipline, one will be for the idea of obedience of St. Ignatius, of the former officer, are more likely to find understanding than in the past liberalist era.

"The cuddly moral theology of St. Alphonsus". In his *Theologia moralis*, published in 1748, a comprehensive work in Latin, St. Alphonsus deals with the 6th and 9th commandments with the obvious reluctance of a sensitive, pious person. Of the material in the book, this line only covers about a ninetieth part! Now, so that the priest knows what kind of sins can happen to him and how they should be viewed in terms of their seriousness, he is talking about individual things about which he would have been only too happy to remain silent, you can ask yourself whether he was perhaps too timid and petty. About a dirty

To speak of moral theology in relation to a work written in Latin and thus exempt from abuse by the curious is much more unfair than if one wanted to make this accusation against the work of a doctor, which deals in the most serious form with sexual pathological diseases for medical professionals. Only men like Graßmann and the apostate Jesuit b. acted dirty. Hoensbroech, who explained to the people in German translation what St. Alphonsus, in his - one might say over-anxious - attitude, expressly asks the user of his book not to read until he believes that he needs to know about such things in pastoral care.

The sectarian struggles of the past occupy a particularly large space. Anyone who loves their people will do everything not to unnecessarily reopen old wounds. Science can also deal with these things calmly and dispassionately; It will immerse itself in the spirit and conditions of the past and strive to understand both sides. Above all, it will have to be guided by the strictest pursuit of truth. The strictest truthfulness and avoidance of slogans that are all too easily misunderstood must also be required if the religious struggles of the past are dealt with in popular works today for a broader readership. This is the only way we can serve our people and fatherland.

R. reports on an alleged sale of the papal legate Meander. She is said to have fallen at the Reichstag in Worms when Meander was absent. If you look at the certificates one at a time, it becomes increasingly unlikely. Meander did not publicly or publicly make such an innovation; there is no doubt about that. She is said to have fallen somewhere private. Luther writes in a letter to W. Link in Nuremberg: Spalatin has heard of her. The Nuremberg city clerk Lazarus Spengler writes that Aleander, "whom they report to me here as a baptized Jew," is said to have made the change to "a number of honorable people." Understvo it is said that it was done in front of an honorable person. Wherever it is reported, it is always: one says that it should; nobody knows where and when and in whose presence. Who is not reminded of how many false rumors arise today? Perhaps the rumor was just as true as the one about "baptized Jews", namely completely false; perhaps a completely different statement by Meander was misunderstood and then carried forward in the bitterness that prevailed among Luther's followers at the time; perhaps it was also the case, as the Protestant theologian D. Clemen says: "The rumor probably arose from the coarsening of one of Meander's sayings" (pamphlets from the first years of the Reformation I, 1907, p. 208). He certainly did not fall in the way in which he was tortured by the excited Luther supporters. That's why he's rightly leaving the discussion today 5.

Pope Innocent X is certainly wrongly accused of not having had enough of 30 years of bloodshed. It is about the protest that Innocent X. i. l. In 1650, i.e. two years after the Peace of Westphalia, against several of his articles, backdating them to the year 1648, because these articles, such as B. the subjugation of a whole series of dioceses could not be approved. Literally

He writes: "We have learned with great pain that through various articles... the most serious injustice has been done against the Catholic religion, the service of God, and the Roman apostolic see..." Only against these articles, which he does not consider can validly recognize, the Pope protests. There was no question of prolonging the bloodshed. The Pope had even intentionally waited to publish the protest until the danger of reprisals from the Swedes through their withdrawal from the territories previously occupied by the German Catholics was used.

The Huguenot War! R. seems to believe in all seriousness that the Huguenots' program included religious freedom for them and the Catholics. The old Huguenots would have rejected this with indignation. Listen to Calvin himself in the *Defensio orthodoxae fidei*, 1554 (Calvini Opera VIII, 453 ff.), where, "... . among other things, means: a righteous authority will not only protect the true doctrine, it will not only force the less inclined to believe, but also so that Christ retains the place that is due to him in the state in which it rules by his grace not allow his holy name and his teachings to be mocked and attacked. The heretics kill souls with the poison of their teachings, and the authorities should spare their bodies?... God has ordered that those who tried to seduce the (Israelite) people into idolatry be killed... They now like God himself accuse those who regard apostasy from the true faith as a minor offense of cruelty. Anyone who, in the face of this divine command, still wants to claim that it is wrong to punish heretics and blasphemers is knowingly and willingly guilty of blasphemy. God demands that entire cities be destroyed and their inhabitants killed if they turn to idolatry. Let those merciful people who want to guarantee impunity for heresy see from this how little they agree with the commandment of God. In order to save the Church from being accused of being too strict, they would like to give free rein to pernicious errors for the benefit of a single person. But God demands that entire cities be torn down and all their inhabitants destroyed." Calvin builds his view of not tolerating deviant doctrine on the Old Testament passages against toleration of idolatry. In 1559, Calvin wrote in his explanation of the prophet Bacharias: "Spreading false doctrines is a greater crime than murdering an innocent person, poisoning a guest or laying hands on one's own father. All other evil acts do not come close to this terrible crime" (Opp. XLIV, 348). The state view to which Calvin professes is therefore, as the Protestant historian G. Beherhaus says (*Studies on Calvin's State View*, Berlin 1910, p. 150): absolutely irreconcilable with the principle of toleration.

A whole cloud of witnesses could be brought forward to show that, just as Calvin the teacher thought, so did all of Calvinism. Suffice it to say that all Calvinian official creeds emphasize the right and duty of the authorities to suppress dissenting doctrines by force. As an example, let's take even the French from 1559, which says we believe that God puts the schivert in his hand

"The authority has placed the order to suppress the sins, not only against the second table (i.e. the 4th to 10th commandments), but also against the first table" (Müller, *The Confessions of the Reformed Church*, p. 232), or the Dutch, which one must take into account when assessing the severity of the struggle in the Netherlands: "It is the duty of the authorities to destroy the empire of the Antichrist (which means the Catholic Church)... and to ensure that that the pure doctrine be preached everywhere" (Müller, p. 248), or the Scottish one from 1560: "We confess that it is the office of kings, princes and authorities to protect the pure religion and to purify the polluted one, because ... they are set up to suppress all idolatry and all super-belief, which can be seen in David, Jehoshaphat, Ezechias, Josiah and the other kings," or finally the Hungarian from 1562: "Their (the authorities') cause is, above all, to shoot at the Church of God, to destroy idols, to punish idolatry and those who say mass." But every child learned what the idolaters were from the Reformed Catechism, the Heidelberg: "The Mass is basically nothing other than a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and an accursed idolatry" (Müller p. 704 and 315 ff.) ".

Therefore, practically everywhere where Calvinism rose to power, Catholicism was suppressed with extreme violence and the death penalty. If he had achieved victory in France, he would have been wiped out just as he had been in Geneva or Scotland. That is the reason why war had to break out in France, Calvin's home country, where his teachings were enthusiastically received, and why these wars were fought so bitterly by both sides. One can give full credit to the Calvinists' loyalty to their convictions and to their ruthless implementation of their ideals. Nothing is more wrong than seeing them as advocates of modern freedom of conscience. Therefore, the entire account that R. gives of the Huguenots is untenable. Quite apart from the fact that he knows nothing about the numerous Catholics who died as victims of their faith under the most exquisite tortures in France and England.

This is for general correction. In detail, everything that R. mentions is historically untenable. The fact that "Coligny's head was sent to Rome" is an old fairy tale that has long since been dismissed. Furthermore, if Coligny really did grant the Catholics freedom of belief in Chatillon, which I can find no evidence of, then this would be by far the majority Catholic lands, under a Catholic king. As Lord of France, Coligny would never have thought of allowing Catholics to practice their faith. If one takes into account Pius V's harsh letters in the Zaf after the victory of Iarnac, one should Don't forget to mention the atrocities the Pope had to deplore and mention that the Huguenots had committed against Catholics.

Just a few words about R.'s latest information. Dante is by no means i. 3. Damned in 1864. On the contrary, he was highly honored by the popes despite his sharp language against Boniface VIII and against abuses, which he accused the Curia of in individual passages in his *Divine Comedy*. Leo XIII has his own professorship for Dante studies in Rome

built. How R. came to his mistake becomes immediately clear when one reads in Chamberlain, Fundamentals II, p. 621, that the basic principles about the relationship between church and state represented by Dante in his work, De Monarchia, are supported by the Sentences 75 and 76 of the Syllabus Pius IX. March 6, 1864 or, as Chamberlain misunderstood for R., "succumbed to a double anathema." R. probably read that all too quickly and the syllabus, which of course has nothing at all to do with Dante, made into an explicit condemnation of Dante and then added that of the sewer from his memories.

Pius IX On January 18, 1874, he spoke neither to international pilgrims nor about Germany, but to Peapolitan bilgers about things that concerned them. He did not do the reform in question at all 10.

As R. says, there is no such priestly oath. There is probably a pure oath of faith, but it has nothing to do with what R. writes about.

Likewise, there is not a single word in the bishop's oath that could sharpen the denominational differences or reflect love for the under-believers. R.'s statement is incorrect 11.

The fact that Luther was considered a vile scoundrel of Roman doctrine in all states needs no refutation. Nowhere will R. be able to substantiate this claim. But a look at the Catholic church history textbooks will show him that people readily recognize the religious seriousness of Luther and his reform villas.

And finally the last pontificates. If everything has really been forgotten, all efforts of Benedict XV. for Germany, which is suffering from the war and the consequences of the war, its collections and aid donations, its efforts for the prisoners, and so much else that should also be remembered by those who do not know how much hostility this Pope was faced by Germany's opponents, because he was friendly to Germany and because he really made Germany happy before the bitter end of the war?

10a. Or even how can R. of Pius XI. They say that "its politics are clearly marked by a new Counter-Reformation, whipping up all the instincts of the Inquisition, in order to break Germanic Germany forever." One scratches one's head, where is even the shadow of the shadow of the Belveise for such a claim? Pius spoke the German language when he was a librarian in Milan devoting his free time to German pastoral care, and when he was the nuncio in Poland he was the target of the sharpest attacks because he supported the German Cardinal Bertram in his defense against the abuse of religious resources by Polish propaganda in the Upper Silesian voting area, to hand over the basses to the nuncio, i. H. to expel him who, as Pope, has repeatedly given evidence of his love for Germany, who has done everything to help those in need in Germany, who in the difficult times of our economic

Depression gave German scholars, both Protestant and Catholic, the means to continue their research! Truly, the world-famous German scholar, who himself beamed with joy, did not think the same way as he told me about the Pope's generosity, since he had, so to speak, helped him, the Protestant, with what he could provide the same amount with which he previously helped an equally famous German Catholic scholar. And who is fighting for the preservation of the German language in the religious life of South Tyrol, for priests of German origin there, if not Pius XI? And with success!

Finally, I raise the question again, as I did twice before at the end of the other two parts: Is even one of the passages discussed here that were written down by R. on the history of the church in modern times correct? And again the answer has to be: Not even a single one! They are either completely wrong or incorrect in essential lines.

One last word! Again and again R. becomes addicted to persecution in the church. Spitefulness, merciless intolerance. He allows the religious struggles of the 16th century to flare up before the reader. Can it happen without the reader, who is ignorant of history, who thinks everything is correct because it is printed, getting into the sharpest anti-Catholic mood? Catholic fellow citizens are alienated in the deepest soul?

We Catholics think completely differently. We know that we have a holy duty to God, precisely because we love our church, to also love the other believers. In the words of the noble, i. 3. Cologne Auxiliary Bishop Dr. Dr., who died all too early in 1923 Stoffels says: "Belonging to the church and being able to work on Christ's work in it is the great happiness of the children of the church. Certainly, God leads his reign big and far. The church does not restrict him. We cannot draw any limits to his work of grace, not even the limits that coincide with those of the Church. Everything good, even outside the church, is brought about by him. We know the Catholic doctrine of the inner belonging to the Church of those who, through no fault of their own, stand outside the visible Church, but are connected to Christ through sanctifying grace and through him to the Father, and also to the Geete of the Church 12." And just as here the educator of young theologians became fifth priests, exactly the same way Pius IX, the pope of the so much misinterpreted syllabus, spoke when he said in a motu proprio of December 9, 1854 that it is quite certain, that those who do not recognize the true religion, if this non-recognition is insurmountable, have no guilt before God because of this ignorance. Now who would presume to determine the limits of this non-recognition, with regard to the diversity and nature of the Peoples, countries, spirits and so many other circumstances 18".

The Church is not intolerant, even if it holds fast to the word and desire of its divine Master that there should be one Shepherd and one flock. Nothing is dearer to us as Catholics than peace, sincere, trusting peace with our non-Catholic brothers in Germany. Is it so difficult to understand us? Is it really possible for a man

how R. speaks of Catholics and their church as if he were living on another planet? If the church doesn't at least have the right to keep quiet about all of its good and great things, to shine a bright light on everything that has happened to its members in almost 2000 years, it doesn't have the right to at least just say that , what is true? Would it really be impossible for the author himself to withdraw his book, which is now full of errors? Shouldn't it actually happen? How will our fatherland heal in its dire need if respect for religion and respect for foreign beliefs does not become the unwritten basic law of public life?

These examinations of the much-mentioned book were carried out with ardent love for the fatherland and the Church, with the sole aim of ensuring that they were dispassionately fair, strictly scientific and truthful, and that they were positive for the development of the fifth. The word of the Lord shone before them:

"You will know the truth, and the truth will set you free" Jo. VIII, 32.

II

To the Holy Scripture

first section

The Old Testament (A.T.)

The entire New and Old Testament belong to Holy Scripture. The Catholic Church has never taught otherwise. For her, the Old Testament is as good as the New *scriptura divinitus inspirata* "Scripture inspired by God" (2 Tim. 3, 16). All those who, since Marcion, out of Gnostic dualism or misunderstood anti-Judaism, believed they should demand a Christianity without the Old Testament, found an implacable opponent in the church. The church will not give up this position, which has been maintained and consolidated in constant struggle, even in the face of the latest attacks; it could not do so without giving itself up. R. has to admit this himself: "You have 'It is quite right when they declare that if the 'Old Testament' or the Nicene Creed were forced out of the building of the churches, then the stones would be missing and the whole building would therefore have to collapse" (p. 133).

But for R. the very fact that the Old Testament is the "cornerstone" in the building of churches, both Catholic and devout, is one of the two stumbling blocks that he finds in church faith, which for him is the recognition of this The German people have made churches an impossibility, the worst sin against the voice of the Nordic blood. R. cannot forgive Luther that "in Worms he laid his hand on the New and Old Testament at the same time" (p. 129).

But the greatest sin of Protestantism was, instead of listening to it (namely the good news of German mysticism), it turned the so-called (1) Old Testament into a people's book and presented the Jewish letter as an idol" (p . 218).

R.'s exaggeration of the Nordic race, his unconditional rejection of After all, everything Jewish left him no other choice. For him, the Old Testament is a purely Jewish work; he calls it Jerusalem" (p. 13), "Jewish letter" (p. 218), the "Jewish Bible" (pp. 245, 250), whereas he calls it only for Nordic people There is one attitude: complete rejection! Only one consequence remains for the new German religion preached by R.:

The aforementioned Old Testament must therefore be abolished once and for all as a religious book. This eliminates the failed attempt of the last millennium and a half to make us spiritually Jews, an attempt to which we, among other things, We also have our present material Jewish rule to thank for" (p. 603). "For the Old Testament stories of clerks and cattle traders will be replaced by Nordic legends and fairy tales, initially simply told, later taken up as symbols. Not that one "It is not the dream of hatred and murderous messianism, but the dream of honor and freedom that must be fueled by Nordic, Germanic legends" (p. 614). "This coming Beit, however, affirms both the Strasbourg Cathedral and the Wartburg, but denies the presumptuous Roman center as well as the Jerusalem Old Testament" (p. 13).

It is no longer just a question of a "cleaning" of the Old Testament, which Protestant biblical criticism has called for here and there, but rather a complete abandonment. The last reason for this unconditional rejection of the Old Testament is clearly revealed in these statements: the fact that R. cannot see in it anything more than the Jewish Bible, whose recognition ultimately made Christianity a "Jewish" religion. Catholicism is therefore a "Jewish-Roman worldview" (p. 252). Because the Reformation was unable to free itself from the Old Testament, it is also to blame for the fact that "the measure of value for our soul life lay outside of the German essence, even if it was not as clearly identifiable geographically as in the case of the Antichrist in Rome." (p. 129) Because the Bible became a people's book and Old Testament prophecy became a religion, "the Judaization and rigidity of our lives was pushed a new step further, and it is no wonder that from then on blonde German children appeared every Sunday had to sing: To you, to you, Jehovah, I will sing, because Ivo is a God like you..." (p. 129).

An interim remark must be inserted here. R. is by no means the first to fight the Old Testament as a Jewish intellectual product from the standpoint of Nordic people. Paul de Lagarde and R.'s direct teacher, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, had expressed similar opinions decades ago, albeit less forcefully and forcefully. In the post-war period, it was above all Friedrich Delitzsch who, in his work "The Great Deception" (Stuttgart and Berlin 1920), declared that the Old Testament was "completely dispensable for the Christian church and thus for the Christian family" and then continued: "It would be incomparably more advisable for us to immerse ourselves from time to time in the deep thoughts that our German spiritual heroes thought about God and the afterlife and immortality" (p. 95).

There is no need to speak further about others who proclaimed similar teachings. R. can be seen as its loudest and most prominent exponent.

What can we say about R.'s excessive accusations? Is Christianity really over-Jewish by adopting the Old Testament? Is this to blame for today's material Jewish rule" (p. 603), for the "Judaization and rigidity of our lives" (p. 129)? Is the Old Testament actually a "Jewish Bible" in the ultimate sense?

Before we address the questions raised by the discussion about the OT, we must first point out the basics very clearly: either we are Christians and then with the whole of Holy Scripture, with N. 2. and OT or we are not Christians. Because Jesus Christ is inseparably linked to the Old Testament in his person, his life, his word and his work. Anyone who rejects the A. Z. out of racial prejudice is rejecting Jesus Christ. (How R. avoids this consequence by making a more or less arbitrary distinction between "positive" and "negative Christianity", more of this later on p. 79.)

Ms the church considers the Old Testament to be authoritative and holy scripture explained, she did not do this in order to accommodate Judaism, in order to "bergözen" the Hebrew parasite people (p. 12). She did nothing other than what her divine founder did. If historical documents are still valid in some way, one cannot and must not doubt the recognition of the Old Testament by Christ and his apostles. It means disregarding all the rules of historical research and thoroughly misunderstanding the personality of Jesus when R. says with de Lagarde: "Paul brought the Old Testament into the church" (p.

457). Christ is closely associated with the Old One Testament. "Do not think that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets. I have not come to abolish them, but to fulfill them. For verily I say to you, not a single grain of it will pass away from the law, until heaven and earth pass away, until everything is fulfilled" (Matt. 5, 17 f.). Jesus points the rich young man to the law: "Keep the commandments!" (Mt. 19, 17; cf. Mt. 10, 19; Lk. 18, 20).

According to Jesus' own words, the Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) must be fulfilled in him (Lk. 22, 37; 24, 44; 30. 5, 39). In order for the Scripture to be fulfilled, the virgin had to give birth to the son (Is. 7:14), Jesus had to be born in Bethlehem (Mic. 5:2), the "voice of one crying in the wilderness" (Is. 40:3).) can be heard in John the Baptist. In order that the Scripture would be fulfilled, Christ, "the shepherd, was stricken" (Bach. 13, 7), his clothes were divided (Pf. 21, 19), but no bone was allowed to be broken (Exodus 12:46). And according to the Scripture (Jonas Confession), Jesus rose from the dead on the third day and in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy (2:28-32) the Holy Spirit came.

Jesus relies on the fact that the holy writings of his people speak of him in their examples, in their hopes and in their Advent longing. He knows that he has been sent by the Father to fulfill what has been given of old

to redeem the divine word and save his people and the world. For example, one scene is told in its entirety:

"So he came to Nazareth, where he grew up. In accordance with his custom, he went to the synagogue on the Sabbath and stood up to read. He was given the book of the prophet Isaias. He rolled up the book and hit the place where it was written:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me;
he has anointed
me to bring good news to the poor; He
has sent me (to heal the brokenhearted), to proclaim
deliverance to the
captives, recovery of sight to
the blind, redemption to the oppressed,
to proclaim a year of
the Lord's favor (and a day of vengeance).'

Then he rolled up the book, gave it to the servant and sat down. Uller's eyes in the synagogue were focused on him. And he began to say to them, 'Today this scripture which you have just heard has been fulfilled' (Luke 4:16-21).

The apostles also refer to the Old Testament, in keeping with the spirit of their Lord. Her preaching to the Jews always culminates in the proof that in Christ the prophecies of the Holy Scriptures have been fulfilled. The Gospels and letters written by the apostles and disciples of the apostles are a single reflection of this early Christian sermon, which is intimately connected with the Old Testament. And it is not appropriate to try to construct a contrast between the Pharisee" Paul and the "aristocrat" John; all the apostles are, in the same way as their divine teacher, imbued with the fact that in the writings of the Ult Covenant they are given "holy scriptures." Since

the church is built on the foundation stone of Jesus Christ, so it is like Christ in their preaching, in their piety, connected to the Old Testament. It is not possible to record in just a few moments how intimate, strong, lively and fruitful this connection has been over nineteen centuries and how it will remain until the end of life. In the prayers of the Old Testament, we, the priests, also pray the Psalms every day, we all pray in the Holy Mass (Amen, Alleluia, Hosanna), like everyone else every day ("All eyes are waiting for you, O Lord"). And that's fine for us "foreign" language. In the symbols of the OT we capture the sacrifice of St. Mass (the sacrifice according to the order of Melchizedek, Christ the true paschal lamb, "Now Isaac is slain"), in the words of the Old Testament we sing ("A rose has sprung up", "Taw, heaven, the righteous"), and we find songs that are familiar and at home to us. We also stand up in the trust in God of the Old Testament (the Lord gave it, the Lord took it away, blessed be the name of the Lord"). In our Che, the Church says, "May , the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob bless you", and in the liturgy of the Church the "Rorate, coeli" and the lamentations of Good Friday shine in beauty.

The Church of Christ, indeed all of Christendom, honors the Holy Scriptures. Generations wrote them off and surrounded them with treasures; Our oldest manuscripts date back a millennium and a half, their value cannot be compared with gold, and the Holy Scriptures have been translated into countless languages and dialects.

The teaching of the Catholic Church, most recently expressed at the Vatican Council, is clear: that the holy books are written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have God as their author and as such (i.e. as inspired writings) are given to the Church itself". It would take us too far to justify and explain this "compulsory belief" in detail. It may suffice to refer to the book by N. Peters, *Our Bible*, which is particularly recommended today. "The life sources of the Holy Scripture" (Paderborn 1929), before reading everything in more detail (pp.-43-46). Whoever criticizes the Old Testament, confuses Christ, confuses the apostles, rejects the church, and renounces of Christianity, denies the development of the last centuries! Doubt

It is for us to that we follow the word of Christ and the church believe except our fathers, to whom the OT is a book of God. But even for non-Christians the Old Testament is often sacred, if not as a book of God, then at least as a book of humanity. Only a few men are listed as witnesses who are authorities of the first rank for R. (see the list of names for the "myth"!). Goethe, for example, confesses: "As a person, I hold the Bible dear and valuable; almost you alone "I owed my moral education, and the events, the teachings, the symbols, the parables, everything had left a deep impression on me and had been effective in one way or another." Just as all our wanderings in the Orient are prompted by the Holy Scriptures, so we always return to them as the most refreshing spring waters, although here and there they are clouded, hidden in the earth, but then springing out again pure and fresh." Nietzsche also stands full of admiration for the Old Testament: "In the Jewish Ult Testament, the book of divine justice, there are people, things and sayings on such a grand scale that Greek and Indian literature has nothing to compare with it. Man stands with horror and awe before these enormous remnants of what man once was, and will have his sad thoughts about ancient Asia and its small peninsula Europe, which would definitely represent the 'progress of man' compared to Asia. The taste The Old Testament is a touchstone in terms of big and small." Many more voices could be added to these voices, and it must remain the same: The Ult Testament is an eternal book of humanity of such imperishable religious and aesthetic value that it cannot be measured by eras and races. And moreover: it is a book of God!

Fundamental and radical rejection of the Old Testament is possible for those who do not believe in a God who can reveal himself. For such a non-revelation believer, the Old Testament is just a human act, and if for him it is the work of a people who he furthermore sees as incapable of any noble achievement, then he must reject it, completely independent of any examination of its intrinsic value. For R., however, religion is in no way "the recognizing certain supernatural teachings as forced beliefs

bensjāze (dogmas)" (p. 608). One cannot expect any understanding from R. that a religion relies on divine revelation and makes this revelation of a personal God, which is deposited in Holy Scripture and tradition, its basis. The Christian Bible in particular

It is never regarded as Holy Scripture of divine origin and therefore **зат** To be able to recognize faith obligatorily.

But anyone who believes in a transcendent, personal God can take offense at the fact that this God revealed himself to the Jewish people and not to the Germanic people. What human being could claim the right to argue with God about this? And once it is certain that God has revealed himself, man has only one alternative: believing acceptance of the divine word. Because this word of God applies everywhere and to everyone and has a supranational and supraracial character. God's revelation may have come to a Jewish or Nordic person, and may therefore have been cast in a Jewish or Nordic form; what we hear, what obliges us, is neither Jewish nor Nordic, but divine word.

It would be wrong if one wanted to overlook and eliminate the human factor in the transmission and writing of Revelation, but it is equally wrong to view the content of Revelation, i.e. the concept of God in the Ult Testament, as "blood-bound" (p. 11). Therefore, it should be presented as not binding for people of other blood. In this view, the phrase "Jewish Bible" is at least ambiguous. The name of the Old Testament is correct if one means to say that God entrusted his revelations to the Jews and had them recorded by Jewish people and handed down to posterity; But it would be wrong if one wanted to describe the entire content of the Holy Scripture as a Jewish-human intellectual product and therefore as alien and unacceptable to other races, as R. apparently does.

Christianity is therefore not "ber-Jewish" because it adopted the Ult Testament not as a "Jewish" book, but as a book containing divine revelation. It was precisely the fact of the "fulfillment" of all revelation in Jesus Christ that prevented the church from overestimating the Old Testament and taught it to distinguish between what had temporary value and what should have eternal value" (Faulhaber). The Old Testament does not stand before us as something absolute, closed in itself, but as something that points beyond itself and awaits fulfillment. We know how hard the original church had to fight against the absolutization of the Mosaic law in particular, against a Jewish-Christian current that wanted to turn the pagan into a Jew before he could become a Christian. Here she was also able to refer to Christ, who himself, especially in the Sermon on the Mount, emphatically emphasized the imperfect and preparatory character of the Old Testament: "You have heard that it was said to the ancients, but I say to you..." (Mt . 5. 21. 27. 31. 33. 38. 43). The law of Moses was precisely the bookmaster toward Christ," as Paul puts it (Gal. 3:24).

I. The Old Testament concept of God

For R., the characterization of the Old Testament as a "Jewish" creation results in the logical rejection of the idea of God represented by the Old Testament. It is "blood-, bound", and consequently this Syrian way of life and mentality does not concern us in the least" (p. 11) "Just imagine a face with a crooked nose, hanging lips, piercing black eyes and woolly hair to immediately realize the plastic impossibility of the embodiment of the European God through a Jewish head (let alone through a Jewish figure). the church of Rome. With their help, the desert demon (!) knew the God of Europe. Anyone who didn't want him was burned or poisoned" (p. 294; see 264). A strange logic that the school of Friedr. Delitzsch doesn't want to deny it. Because R. cannot acquire any taste for the external appearance of today's Jew, he believes he has to reject the God as the pre-Christian Jews imagined him. It is difficult to understand to what extent the inner idea of God should form one essence with the Jewish external one. It should be said again: Anyone who believes in a transcendent God can and may take offense at the fact that this God has revealed himself to a people of a foreign race. It is impossible to speak of a "Jewish," Germanic," etc. God when one means the one, true God.

That the God of the Old Testament is really the true God can no longer be doubtful after what has been said about the revelatory character of the Old Testament. The church's faith has also stood unwaveringly here since Marcion. More than once the Church has declared that the God of the Old and New Testaments is one and the same" (Decretum pro Jacobitis). Taking into account the moment of revelation in Revelation, it is not surprising that the Old Testament concept of God is not yet at its peak of the New Testament. However, these recognized imperfections and one-sidedness of the Old Testament in no way justify R.'s summary judgment that the "cosmic God" cannot be identical with the doubtful expressions of the Old Testament" (p. 11) 8 .

Where R. tries to outline the concept of God in the Old Testament in more detail, the same description can be noted that was already found in Friedr. Delitzsch finds in his "Great Deception". It is impossible for R. to speak of Jahve other than of the "desert demon" (p. 294), the "demon elevated to God", the "God's Thrawn" (p. 247). "The aloof, terrible God who sits enthroned above all is the Yahweh of the so-called Old Testament, whom one praises with bitterness and worships in fear. Create us all

out of nothing, he performs magical, miraculous deeds when it suits him and forms the world for his glorification" (p. 246). The Gospel of John should be understood as "the first ingenious interpretation, the experience of the eternal polarity of good and evil against the Old Testament delusion that Yahweh created good and evil out of nothing, at the same time said of his world that it was very good, and then himself became the instigator of lies, deceit and morotic acts" (p. 604). "Rome-Yahweh means: magical despotism, magical creation from nothing (a crazy idea for us)" (p. 248).

R. expresses his judgment about the God of the Old Testament in such and similar succinct sentences. One has to ask how such a judgment is possible! A thorough, unbiased study of the Old Testament could only lead to completely different results. In the debates of the last decades, real specialists have repeatedly emphasized that the high moral belief in one God is one of the most valuable assets of the Old Testament, and the most unmistakable evidence of its superhuman origins. It is a direct untruth, and, from a Christian perspective, a terrible blasphemy, to claim that Yahweh "created good and evil out of nothing," that he is the instigator of lies, deceit, and morotic deeds. Only a very gross misunderstanding of individual Old Testament passages could give the casual accusation a semblance of justification. The Old Testament in particular repeatedly praises holiness as a fundamental attribute of God 10. "Be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy!" (Lev. 19:2; cf. 11:44; 21:8). And when in the Old Testament the hardening of Pharaoh and the command to exterminate the Canaanites are attributed to God, this is ultimately due to an overemphasis on the causality of God at the expense of the so-called second cause of the human will. God as Creator is naturally the first author of everything; his ultimate causality extends roughly to the sin, guilt and punishment of the godless. They are members of his world plan. The fact that sin nevertheless remains free of man is just as certainly the teaching of the Old Testament, "How the coexistence of human freedom and God's causality remains a great mystery to human understanding" (Tridentinum)" 11.

Whoever speaks of the "unapproachable, terrible" talking God of the Old Testament should not forget to add that the "demonic" (to use the expression) or the tremendum makes up only one side of the Old Testament concept of God. Certainly in the ancient times man's sense of distance from God was more strongly emphasized. But if the divine will with its high demands was to prevail over the harsh customs of that time, the emphasis on the fear motive, which was initially strange to Christians, was not at all. This is precisely where the subtle mismatch of divine revelation with the respective situation of the human race becomes apparent, and nothing would be more wrong than to absolutize a mere stage of revelation and to disregard an internally possible and actually occurring development. Знбег

In the oldest writings of the Old Testament, in addition to justice and majesty, love and mercy, goodness and loyalty are also mentioned as equally self-evident qualities of God. Anyone who wants to reinterpret this lively and fruitful coexistence and intermeshing into an opposition to one another is also hitting the New Testament's concept of God. Here too it is equally true that the Christian has not received the spirit of bondage to new fear, but the spirit of adoption" (Rom. 8:15), and that he should "work out his salvation in fear and bitterness" (Phil. 2, 12).

It is a direct reversal of the truth when R. claims that "the Jewish-Shrish-Roman world of thought" "tears personality and God apart and opposes them in hostility" (p. 395), when he speaks of the "The complete separation of the personality of God lives on in strictly Jewish-ecclesiastical Christianity" (p. 396). One only has to read the fine work of the Protestant theologian I. Hempel, *God and Man in the Old Testament* (Stuttgart 1926) 12 to see, how one-sidedly and incorrectly R. judges the actually religious relationship between man and God in the light of Old Testament piety. That "the Roman idea of the demon elevated to God (1) represents the destruction of our willful soul, an attempted assassination of the polarity of... "spiritual being" can only be represented by someone who is not satisfied with the "likeness to God" and demands "equality to God" of the human soul (p. 247). This of course denies not only the Old Testament and the Catholic, but every Christian

concept of God. Again and again in the Old Testament one can read about the incorruptible justice of God, which "recognizes no respect for persons". One is therefore somewhat surprised to see Marcion's old, much-used word about "an arbitrary divine power and its unlimited tyranny" in R to see a revival with new emphasis (p. 75, see 248). Even Protestant biblical criticism, which, following in the footsteps of I. Wellhausen, liked to use similar formulations for the concept of God in the older books other than the Old Testament¹³, must today confess that the God of the Old Testament is really a just, incorruptible one Judge is". This is already taken for granted by the old

Beit" 14. One of R.'s last objections needs to be acknowledged briefly. Again, Friedr says. Delitzsch (*The Great Deception* 71) says that "Iahv does not want to be the only God at all, the Old Testament does shows several times that it also applies to the "other" gods, the gods of the other peoples their full reality and for Iahv only the highest Claimed divine dignity. But this supreme God is and remains according to the Teaching of the Old Testament from the oldest to the most recent book, in the years Hundreds before and after the exile the exclusive God of Israel and none People else." R. formulates the same thoughts a little differently: "The Israe-

Lithuanians and Jews were originally in a very positive situation. been biased towards realistic religious life; her national God took care of her and she took care of him, but no one doubted that the other gods were just as real and were active like Jahive" (p. 127).

R. and Delitzsch save themselves the trouble of proving it. For this reason alone, their constellations would simply have to be ignored as uncontrollable. In fact, an unbiased interpretation of the Old Testament produces a completely different result. The official religion never took into account the reality of "other" gods. "For Moses, Jahive alone, who did not tolerate any other gods alongside him, was considered as God," explains the Protestant exegete Sellin 15. Catholic exegesis has never take a different point of view. Since occasional aberrations in popular religion were used as a benchmark, one could come to the assertion that in the early Beit people believed in the existence of foreign gods.

In the same way, the objection from the so-called national limitations of the Old Testament concept of God. Jahive is by no means "the exclusive God of Israel". Just a few passages out of many that speak against it: "All nations should know that he alone is the Highest over all the earth" (Pf. 83, 19). All nations will flock to Mount Sion to worship him (Isa. 2:2-4). The whole earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord! (Numbers 14, 21). Can such things be said of a mere tribal god? "The fact remains: Jahve is the universal ruler of the world from the beginning"

16. This results in the impossibility of R.'s further thesis that "Jews later borrowed the idea of a universal (cosmic) God from the Persians" (p. 129; cf. 11). For a long time it was common in radical biblical literature to trace Israelite monotheism to Babylonian influences. R. can This argument cannot be used because the Babylonians were also Semites and because if biblical monotheism was derived from the Babylonians, the statement that everything noble and valuable came from the Aryans would no longer be justified. That is why the Jews' later conception of God must be the same It is actually not necessary to say that such an assertion is diametrically opposed to the historical facts. So it was only in the captivity of the Bersers, at most after 538 BC, that the Jews were said to be from a universally secular ("cosmic) God" (p. 127)! How all the passages in the Old Testament that testify to a universal idea of God for the Mosaic prayer (around 1000 years earlier!) should be explained is something that R. does not have the answer to! There is really no need to go into the internal, essential differences between the Old Testament and Persian conceptions of God. If one is looking for a justification for the "unsemitic" view of God in the Old Testament, only one remains: it was God himself who revealed his name and his nature to the Israelite people and entrusted it to be ultimately passed on to all of humanity.

In summary, one has to say: R.'s drawing of the Old Testament concept of God is totally distorted and cannot be proven from the literary sources. On this point, R. places the highest demands on his readers' lack of criticism. It is far from being as far as R. proclaims with pathos that "the ecclesiastical Yahweh is dead today like Wotan was 1,500 years ago" (p. 134).

2. Bible and science

The fact that the Holy Scripture is inerrant creates, at first glance, significant difficulties when it comes to individual explanations, particularly of the Old Testament. How is e.g. B. to reconcile the imperfect representation of scientific objects in the Bible with the claimed inerrancy? Well, the Church has solved this difficulty authentically. Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" (18th XI. 1893) clearly outlined the position of the Church: "The holy writers, or more correctly the Spirit who spoke through them, did not intend to inform people about this (i.e. about the innermost nature of obvious things) because it doesn't help anyone. Instead of doing natural science directly, they sometimes prefer to describe and treat things in a figurative way or in the same way as the common expression of those times it brought with it and ivie it is used today in many things in daily life even among the greatest scholars". This means that all objections that have been made against the inerrancy of Holy Scripture from the standpoint of today's natural scientific knowledge become invalid. The Bible is primarily a religious book, intended to standardize our beliefs and customs. It does not want to be a textbook on natural science and therefore only gives the natural view of its contributions 17. For example. B. the AT does not give us any information about the fact that the earth moves around the sun (see below)

Unfortunately, R. does not spare himself allusions to these "tricky ,things". There are the denominational schools that today seriously want to teach geography and mathematics on the basis of their Old Testament revelations, even though they have to admit with anger that right after their religious "Depiction of Yahweh's creation from nothing and Noah's Ark and the famous 6,000 years of world creation, the eternity of the universe is claimed and millions of years of earth formation are claimed as a prerequisite for our earthly existence" (p. 625). One is not a little surprised at the certainty with which R. makes statements here. In fact, the eternity of the universe and of matter has never been proven by anyone and, as many natural scientists teach today, will probably never be proven. But when it comes to the "famous 6,000 years of the creation of the world," R. probably knows that we do not understand this in the true sense, and that it is not taught that way in Catholic schools either. Even if the Bible speaks of a "six-day work." , she is not concerned with a scientific description of the creation of the world, but with the religious teaching that God created the world. Likewise, the "world view of the indestructible disk of destruction with heaven above and hell below" is not a belief taken from the Bible. Here, too, it is only a time-dependent expression that the Bible is completely unable to teach as a scientific truth. This is omitted also the conclusion that R. draws from this

to be able to draw from the language of the Bible based on mere visual evidence that "Copernicus, who replaced the static world view of the immovable earth disk with heaven above and hell below, the dynamic of the eternally free solar systems, our entire "The church's compulsory doctrine of belief, which has completely overcome the entire mythology of the descent into hell and the resurrection, has settled it once and for all" (p. 133). One has to wonder at the carelessness with which this ancient, long-refuted monistic objection is put forward by R. In Last century, D. F. Strauss and E. Häckel announced exactly the same thing. They too had to admit that their accusation does not apply to the Bible at all. Because nowhere does the Bible aim to teach us about the where of heaven and hell. They only describes the reality of an afterlife and the condition of the souls there¹⁸, and the validity of this dogma does not depend on whether the worldview is "static" or "dynamic".

3. Belief in immortality

"As is well known, we do not find the belief in immortality in the entire so-called Old Testament, unless it is the impact of the demonstrably external influence of the Persians on the Jews in exile" (p. 363). This is due to a lack of practice in The use of theological terms must be attributed to the fact that R. is speaking here of "belief in immortality" and not of "belief in resurrection". However, the belief in a personal resurrection, including of the body, is only fully proven late in the Old Testament. In any case, it is He is present and not an etiva from Persia-Babylonia of Ufzidism that has blown into the Jewish world of thought; he is the logical and essential final link of the entire chain of the Old Testament expectation of the fifth reign of God"¹⁹. But if R. really meant the "belief in immortality," then he would probably be completely alone with the above sentence. The belief in the immortality of the human soul is inherent in the entire Old Testament, as could be proven by countless passages. So sure But the belief in the Geele's continued life after death, the idea of the condition in the afterlife remained unclear until the most recent Beit. The existence of the shadows in the underworld was considered bleak and unattractive. The thought of judgment and retribution was still undeveloped at this stage of revelation, without one being able to blame it. Even if the Israelite's ideal was to live as long as possible on this earth, it is still completely unjustified to give the Old Testament belief in immortality to be dismissed without further ado. One should not confuse immortality with bliss here. ²⁰. It was precisely the firm belief in immortality that provided the basis for the later clearly expressed hope of resurrection, also of the body.

It is misleading when R. on page 363 presents Jewish theories about the paradise available to the righteous on this earth as the teachings of later "holy books". Given the context, the impression must arise as if these fantasy products were somewhere in the Old Testament. That is not the case. Rather, they are extra-biblical writings from late Judaism that have nothing in common with Holy Scripture in the sense of Christianity.

4. Psalms

A word about R.'s judgment on the Psalms! In order to demonstrate the inferiority of Jewish poetry, the Psalms, of all things, must be used as an aside. For R. they are "songs that sometimes flap in fear, sometimes shout in fear, sometimes snort with greed for revenge (which only often sound like this thanks to Luther's rewriting)" (p. 364). In the same context, the psalms have to be put up with being put on the same level as the "vile Heinrich Heine".

To refute it, we can only recommend reading the book of Psalms. the 21st. Among the 150 psalms there are certainly some whose piety ity cannot be measured according to Christian standards the Psalms are no exception to the imperfection discussed above Old Testament in general. In any case, R.'s general verdict is complete unjustified. In terms of both artistic quality and religious content, the book of Psalms as a whole is unrivaled in pre-Christian times. It is perhaps appropriate to mention the Friedr judgment, especially to R. To refer to Delitzsch, who, despite his Fritic attitude to the Old Testament, had to admit that neither Indian nor Babylonian nor Semitic poetry had a collection of songs that was equal in the poetic beauty of many individual poems, but above all in its serious delving into the The riddles of human life and the moving activity of the purest religiosity only allow a comparison to be made with the Ulttestament Book of Psalms, this song of trust in God that swells from the quietest piano to a bolaff-colored fortissimo. Yes, these songs are unique in all of world literature." 23.

The Psalms are sanctified by Christ, who used them in prayer (cf. Mk. 14:26; 15:34), and have been the prayer book of the Christian Church since their first days. They will still be spoken of as brilliant expressions of religious emotion even when other books have long been forgotten.

5. Various corrections

On p. 296, R. says: "Rembrandt was a good Bible researcher (-), and felt obliged to paint many Jewish heads in order to portray biblical stories correctly. He also describes Joseph, who was caught, as he did

Talking with his hands, man prays to the attacked woman Botiphar protests his innocence' (Berlin), but as soon as Rem-

Brandt deals with serious matters, he must be the Amsterdamer

Leaving the ghetto". Only the German language represented by R. is interested here.

tung of the well-known episode from the life of the Egyptian Joseph (Gen. 39,

7-20). According to the Bible, Potiphar's wife wanted to seduce

Joseph into sin. Joseph defends himself with the wonderful word:

„How should I do such a terrible injustice and sin against God?" The

woman's intrigue succeeds in reversing the situation with her husband

and suspecting Joseph of attempted cheating. The man believed his

woman more and had Joseph innocently sent to prison. Well, R. also

considers the woman's lie to be more insightful than the Bible,

which puts the "Jew" Joseph in a better light. He speaks of the "attached"

woman, of Joseph who was "caught" and protested

his "innocence" (in quotation marks!)? One wonders what justification

there is for this obviously false representation of historical facts?

Regardless of other reasons - seen, the credibility of the Bible results from

the fact that it otherwise takes no reason to ignore or gloss over the real

mistakes of the patriarchs and kings (cf. etiva Gen. 20; 26; 27; 2 Sam.

11; 1 Kg. 11) Joseph fares badly with R. On p. 463 it says: "The

character of the Jews in their intermediary activity

and possession of foreign types has always remained the

same, from Joseph in Egypt to Rothschild and

Rathenau, from Philo to David ben Selomo to Heine." In

reality, Joseph "saved through his intermediary activity"

suffered from a great famine. And he couldn't "decompose" the

Egyptian type because, according to R., even the indigenous

ter as "Migobariation between Atlanteans and the Negro-

population (p. 26) no longer had a uniform type! In this context, it is

not about defending the Jews against R.'s two accusations. But if

R. admits heroism exclusively to the Nordic peoples and denies the

Semites any "heroic attitude" (p. 138), on the other hand,

reference must be made to many evidence of genuinely heroic attitudes

in the Old Testament. R. says, for example (P. 138): "The Jewish

people begin with cattle-breeding stories, which,

however, also lack any heroism." A heroic deed of

Abraham is reported to us in Genesis 14. Everyone knows this

ancient story: how the "cattle breeder" Abraham, with only 318 loyal

followers, overran the victorious army of the kings of the East at night,

put them to flight and took their loot back from them. In addition,

renounced how little "merchant"! - to the reward offered

to him (Gen. 14, 22 f.)! Furthermore, are the judges' lathis, the Philistine

battles of Saul and Dabid, the Maffaeans' fight for freedom (to cite just

a few examples) not signs of "heroism" worthy of being placed next to

the blasphemy of Siegfried and Heracles?

A remark by R. on p. 67 creates the impression that the "Great Mother",

the "Great Whore" of the Belasgians, who was later revered in

Rome, was identical with the "beautiful, lovely whore" of Ninibe, who

Nahum 3, 4 should be mentioned. When it comes to the prophet, however, we are not talking about the "beautiful, lovely whore" of Nineveh; rather, the corrupt Ninibe herself appears under the image of a "graceful, magical prostitute" over whom the prophet speaks his woe on behalf of God!

The matter is similar with a comment about an alleged Etruscan tradition of carrying out mating in public. In brackets, R. lightly states: "as did Absalom with David's concubines 2 Sam. 16, 22" (p. 62). What does it say in the Old Testament? "Then they laid a belt for Absalom on the roof, and Absalom went to his father's concubines in the sight of all Israel." First of all, nothing is mentioned here about a Gite, but rather a unique incident, which, as Absalom's later reported punishment shows, was condemned in the strongest possible terms by the author of the books of Samuel. In addition, in contrast to the alleged Etruscan custom, "depublicity" can only be spoken of in a limited sense (Belt!).

It would be asking the Old Testament to do the impossible if one were to do so him the high standard of Christian morality, faith in the clarity of Search for the New Testament. The Old Testament is only one level of divine revelation and therefore contains many things that are imperfect, provisional, Contribution-related. "But that is the law of every development and education Saving the individuality from the simpler and less perfect, yes Perfection through careful, patient, long-term work. to bring out mine and perfected ones" 24. And the one thing is under emphasis of all the imperfections of the Old Testament, it cannot be doubted that It stands before us as a unique religious document, similar to that in the pre-Christian era Nothing can be put aside. Just that changes from year to year in-depth knowledge of the environment in which it was created - R. himself speaks of it "intellectual jungle of the Middle East" (p. 139), has shown more and more clearly that it is purely human work and as a "Jewish book" would be absolutely inexplicable and incomprehensible 25. I would like to conclude with Cardinal Faulhaber's verdict in his "Urbent sermons": "No other people can find such a series of writings in which the basic truths of religious life are presented so clearly, so definitely, so uniformly" (p. 12). Today, when the history and literature of the other peoples of pre-Christian history have been researched, religious studies can draw comparisons. hen, and she will give the testimony to the Volf on the Jordan: You have surpassed them all through your religious heights, you have offered the highest religious values among all peoples of ancient times" (p. 13). In particular, human culture and Christian religion gives the Old Testament a pure and sublime idea of God, the most biblical thing about the Bible, the revelation of Yahweh, the being, of God Sabaoth, the Lord of hosts. About the only God who tolerates his foreign gods next to him. About the transcendental, personal God who, in revelation, bowed down from his infinite heights and spoke to people through his messengers, who gave his law and demanded obedience for this law. About the God who is in the poetic, non-philosophical

language of the psalmists clothed himself with majesty and glory, surrounded himself with light like a cloak, stretched out the heavens like a girdle, made the spirits his messengers and the blazing fire his herald (Psalm 103:1-4). The thought of God is the highest thought that the human spirit can think" (pp. 14/15).

And finally on p. 75/76: "This idea is so unique among all the cultural idiots of antiquity that we have to say: People of Israel, this did not grow as your planting in your garden. This woe over usurious large-scale land ownership, this fight against the over-indebtedness of agriculture, this ban on taking bins is not the spirit of your spirit. Anyone who does not believe in inspiration and does not accept these books as God's word and God's revelation must consider the people of Israel to be the culmination of world history. There is no other choice than this entiveder-or. Either we believe in the inspiration of the Holy Books, or we must say to the Jewish people: You are the most brilliant race in the history of the world. We believe in inspiration. We believe that the Spirit of God has spoken to humanity through the mouth of the chosen prophets. In this belief, we repeatedly demand: German people, protect what you have! Don't let the precious heritage of the Holy Books be taken out of your hands and don't allow Biblical teaching to be eliminated from German schools and thus a serious robbery be committed against German children! Amen."

second part

The new Testament

The New Testament hardly comes off better with R. than the Ulte. Nothing seems more urgent to him than to cleanse the New Testament of the many "falsifying ingredients" that have "deprived us of the opportunity to see the great personality of the founder of Christianity in his true greatness" (p. 13).

"On the part of a struggling person (not a state politician), the movement that strives for the deletion of apparently distorted and superstitious reports from the New Testament must be strengthened. Of course, the necessary fifth gospel cannot be decided by a shnode. It will be the creation of a man who has experienced the longing for purification as deeply as he has searched the science of the New Testament" (p. 603).

So in dry words: God's word should be replaced by human work! The revelation completed in the Son of God Jesus Christ is to be improved based on human discretion! For the Christian, of course, all discussion ends here.

The authenticity, authenticity and credibility of the New Testament is beyond all doubt. 1. Anyone who denies its divine origin and the divinity of Jesus Christ is faced with the need to reinterpret and "improve" historical documents. "Such science" is able to lead shows the unfortunate fate of the radical biblical literature of past decades.

1. The personality of Christ

• What has been said already indicates that for R. Jesus Christ is just a "great personality", but nothing more. Since acknowledgment of Jesus' sonship of God and office of redeemer cannot be out of the question for R. from the outset, all statements in this regard belong to the Gospels or other New Testament writings are among the "falsifying ingredients": "Christian legends" (p. 132) that cannot claim any faith.

"The great personality of Jesus Christ, whatever he may have been, was immediately after his death burdened and merged with all the waste of Near Eastern, Jewish and African (sic!) life" (p. 74). "Virgin Birth ", material resurrection" of Christ, "ascension to heaven and hell" are among the Christian legends that, in all seriousness, are still being proclaimed to Europeans today. According to R., they are on the same level as the "various faces of Catholic saints" (p. 132)! Of course, the miracles reported by Jesus also belong to the realm of legend.

„In the original Gospel of Mark we also find the legendary stories about the possessed, which we can attribute to popular stories as well as the exhausting additions to the adventures of Frederick the Great and St. Francis, who is said to have even preached to the birds" (p. 607).

One wonders how there are readers who have a keen sense of the almost comprehensible arbitrariness with which R. simply ignores ancient traditions that are rightly viewed as historical sources. Where would it lead if everyone claimed the same right as R. to create an image of Christ according to their own taste using any selection of New Testament reports? The multitude of so-called Christian acts shows, in a shocking way, what the result and at the same time the end would be!

Wisely, R. does not attempt to paint the "new image of Jesus" (p. 414) that he demands in every detail. He contents himself

with making a few uninterpretations here and there, as in his opinion Personality of Jesus is to be

understood. First he takes over the tale of Jesus' alleged Aryan origins from Chamberlain, Delitzsch and Dinter. However, the wording is

very cautiously: "As far as Jesus' origins are concerned, as has already been emphasized by Chamberlain and Delitzsch, there is not the slightest compelling reason to assume that Jesus was of Jewish origin, even though he grew up in a Jewish community" (p 76 note. According to p. 27, Jesus came from the "Nordic class" of Galilee formed by the Umorites. What is to be thought of this is aptly described by a word from E. Meher, the famous researcher of ancient history: "Hopefully no one will expect me to discuss the more than naive attempts to prove that Jesus was an Aryan."

According to the note on page 76, R. also relies on E. Jung's book "The historical personality of Jesus" (Munich 1924). "According to the Syrian Christian preacher Ephraem (4th century), Jesus had a Danaite wife as his mother (i.e a native of Dan) and a Latin father." Many spurious writings are attributed to Ephrem († 373). In Ephrem's genuine writings, as with the Fathers, the "Virgin Mary" is glorified. For more information, see Rauschen-Wittig, Patrologie (Freiburg 1921, p. 156 f.), from which I take Ephrem's praise of Mary: "You (o Lord) and your mother, you are the only ones who are beautiful in every way; for in you, O Lord, is fine spot, and there is no blemish in your mother." Ephrem also says numerous times that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, e.g. E.g.: "He is the only begotten of the Father and the only begotten of Mary." "Whoever denies that Mary gave birth to God will never see the glory of his divinity." 3. So Ephrem agrees with the teaching of the Fathers and the New Testament that Jesus was the Son of God, born of Mary the Virgin.

The N.T. testifies that Jesus is the son of David, that is, according to the flesh" was Jewish. They are Israelites; According to Christ, the body comes from them stus" (Rom. 9, 4 f.). We read the family tree of Jesus in Matt. 1, 1-17 and Ek. 3, 24-38. And so the angel Gabriel announced: "Behold, you shall receive and give birth to a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. He will be great and be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him that give the throne to his father David" (Lk. 1, 32 f.). So God redeems the word, which he had already given to Ubraham, the ancestor of the Jewish people: "In your tribe the nations of the heirs shall be blessed" (Gen. 22:18). Not only does R. deny Jesus' divine sonship, he also tries to make things clear that Jesus himself never wanted to be the Messiah in the sense of the Jews. Only a "later world" stamped him as the Messiah. In various places in his book, R. makes statements about this that can easily be refuted. At one point it says: "Above all, Mark knows nothing about Jesus as the fulfiller of the Jewish idea of the Messiah, which Matthew and Bauius gave us, to the detriment of the entire Western cultural world. Even more. When the clever Peter said to Jesus: "You are the Messiah" (Mark 8:29), "Jesus threatened Peter and forbade his disciples to say such things" (p. 604 f.). So R. But what does the last line of the verse quoted read literally? "Then he told them that no one should have anything against him

This makes a completely different sense. Jesus does not reject the title of Messiah forever, but only temporarily forbids his disciples from communicating this knowledge to the people who are not yet ready for it. And Mark in particular later reports on Jesus' vague confession of Messiahship before the High One Rate: „Again the high priest asked him and said to him: Are you the Christ, the Son of the Most Blessed One? Jesus answered: I am, and you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Mf. 14, 61 f.; cf. Mt. 26, 63 f.). How true is that? R.'s claim that Mark knows nothing about Jesus as the "fulfiller" of the Jewish Messiah idea?

Jesus does not appear as the promised Messiah in Mark as often as he does in Matthew. However, this fact is easily explained in the different circle of readers for whom the two Gospels are intended: Matthew writes for Jewish Christians who are already familiar with the idea of the Messiah, Mark, the disciple of Peter, for Gentile Christians, who are shown above all Jesus' superhuman, divine power should.

R. not only knows how to say that Jesus was made the Messiah later, he also tries to explain how this came about. This has already been dealt with in the historical section above, but this passage should be quoted here again in full: "In Asia Minor the Romans exercised a strict regime and relentlessly collected their taxes; As a result, the oppressed population began to hope for a slave leader and liberator: that was the legend of Chrestos. From Asia Minor, this Chrestosmthus reached Palestine, was actively taken up, linked to the Jewish idea of the Messiah and finally transferred to the personality of Jesus, etc. (p. 74).

(For the correction of this completely false statement, see page 6 above.)

In this derivation of the Messiah title Jeju, R. doesn't seem to be quite sure. In another place he claims: "The Christian church appropriated the Persian idea of savior from the prince of world peace Çaoshianç, albeit distorted by the Jewish idea of the messiah" (p. 33; see 130). This claim is also purely arbitrary.

It would go too far to reduce to absurdity all the one-sidedness found in R.'s interpretation of the personality of Christ. Some passages may speak for themselves. For R. "Jesus is the hero. Not the wounded one, not the magically vanished one of the late Gotit', but the uniquely austere personality" (p. 414). But the inner new attitude to the image of Jesus also results in an absolutely necessary, seemingly only external degeneration: the incarnation of the person depicting the torturous crucifixion Crucifixes in churches and on village streets". "A German church will gradually, in the churches assigned to it, represent the teaching fire spirit, the hero in the highest sense, in place of the crucifixion" (p. 616). In another place Jesus is the "outrager

from Nazareth". This litel is illustrated by two Gospel passages taken out of context: "I have not come to bring peace, but the sword". "I want to kindle a fire on earth, and I wish it was already burning." (The first passage comes from the Gospel of the Jewish Belot, which R. so violently rejected" [p. 13] Matthew.) You can do more with Jesus Hardly misunderstood!

2. Christianity

As R. rejects Christ as the Son of God, so he also rejects his casting. R. rejects Christianity, as it is professed by believing Fatholic and Protestant Christians, with the heart of the doctrine being the cross, the Lamb of God who redeemed us from our sins. And he thoroughly rejects it. "With the elimination of the sermons about the servant and the sinner as the Lamb of God, the entrustment of Peter with the founding of the Roman Church, the fulfillment of the Old Testament, indulgences, magical miracle cures, etc., there is a corresponding change of the external usage (rite) must take place" (p. 615/616). We just read that R. consistently demands the removal of the crucifixes.

However, R. does not reject Christianity outright, as we would now assume. Rather, he continues to commit to it. For our Christianity with the cross and the Lamb of God, with humility and mercy, R. calls negative Christianity", - and he contrasts this with "positive Christianity": "The mighty preacher and the one who bears the burden in the temple, the man who carries people away and which they all followed..., the rejoiced one is not the formative ideal that shines forth from the Gospels today" (p. 604). "Negative and positive Christianity have always been in battle and are fighting even more bitterly than before especially in our days" (p. 79). "Positive Christianity once again awakens the powers of the Nordic blood" (p. 79).

But it seems to us that the majesty of the Son of God cannot bear it if someone wants to judge them, rejecting this and that about Christ as negative or recognizing it as positive, depending on the characteristics of their blood. It is Christ who gave every people its own individuality, and he judges the peoples sovereignly, and he demands that they conform to him and not he can align himself with

them. R.'s rejection of the cross is not so much racially based, as he would like to understand it, but is a generally human defense against the thoughts of God, which are often different, as witnessed by Jews and Greeks than people's longing dreams.

The acceptance of the cross and "negative Christianity" is not the same racially determined, but rather the work of God's grace and the involvement of the peoples

God's work. While the majority of Jews rejected the cross, the best times of our people were under the sign of the cross. And the graves of "the two million German heroes who fell in the World War" to whom R. dedicates his book rest under the cross!

"We preach Christ the Delighted: a curse to the Jews, and foolishness to the Gentiles" (1 Cor. 2:23).

!The Jews also wanted a Christ of glory; Their hearts would have flown to a Messiah king who would have powerfully shaken the pillars of the oppressive Roman empire. Above Christ, standing before us and them in power and majesty and dignity and majesty, this Christ had come to seek what was lost, to heal and save, to suffer and die. His people could not understand that, his Apostles couldn't believe it, until the end they dreamed the dream of earthly greatness, and when the cross and death came, they were all lost in Christ. Then the Lord rose from the dead and sent his Holy Spirit, who enlightens us, that we recognize that the cross is not a forgetfulness, that humility is not cowardice, but courage towards the truth and towards oneself, that goodness is not weakness, but the power of God that drives us to be fellow brothers. That is the new thing that is in the world came, the unheard of, what became a scandal, a forgettable for the world. And the new, in the sign of the cross, the actually Christian, the super-human, that is what R. now calls "negative Christianity"! And only that which seems to correspond to his "blood" voice ~~as~~ he calls positive about Christ!

"The natural man does not understand what comes from the Spirit of God. He considers it foolishness, and he cannot understand it because it wants to be understood spiritually (i.e. in the spirit of God)" (1 Cor. 2:14). What R. calls positive Christianity does not just mean denial of the divinity of Jesus, rejection of the Holy Scriptures, rejection of the Church of Christ, that also means rejection of salvation through Christ's sacrifice, cessation of the celebration of Mass as the renewal of this sacrifice, removal of crucifixes not only from schools, no, from churches! And all of this in the name of Christianity — itself! But we profess the Christianity of Christ, the Christianity of the Cross, the Christianity of eternal salvation that God has prepared for us!

III.

On the Eckart problem

For the layperson, it should be noted briefly in advance: Master Eckart was the most important of all medieval mystics. By high mysticism we understand that joyful immersion of the whole mind in the inexhaustible glories of God, whereby speculative thinking and loving will more or less balance each other.

Master Eckart was born around 1260 in Hochheim (Thuringia). He belonged to the knightly class. He became a Dominican and studied in Cologne and Paris. Around 1302 he received the title of magister (hence master) at the University of Paris. He was therefore a professor at this most important of all universities. Thanks to the trust of his order superiors, he became order provincial for Saxony in 1304, i.e. H. northwestern Germany. A few years later he received the honorable task of taking over the Bohemian order province in order to have a particularly reforming effect here. In between he preached with great fame throughout Germany. He then went to the University of Paris for the second time and taught in Cologne towards the end of his life. Here disputes with the Franciscans, who attacked some of his towns, eased. In 1326 the Archbishop of Cologne initiated legal proceedings against him in religious matters. The success was that 28 of Eckart's theses were accepted by Pope John XXII. were condemned in 1329. Two years before the verdict was published, Eckart had already died in Cologne.

His writings are largely in Latin and deal with questions of philosophical and theological, especially exegetical content. His German sermons were published by Pfeiffer in 1857 and are now examined in detail by Josef Quint. Some of the Latin literature has been lost and what remains is mostly unpublished.



The abbreviations Pf. and Dan. hereinafter refer to:

Pfeiffer: "Meister Eckart". 4; unchanged edition. Göttingen 1924.

Daniels: "A Latin justification by Master Eckart". In "Contributions to the history of medieval philosophy", edited by Clem. Bäuml, Vol. XXIII, Issue 5. Münster 1923. Briefly quoted defensorium.

An interpretation

R.'s worldview, his religion of blood, the myth of the 20th century is said to have had its great birth in the 13th century, namely in Meister Eckart. In him the Nordic soul came to full consciousness of itself for the first time; all of our later greats lie embedded in his personality." So writes R. S. 259.

R. wants to prove that "the original dogmas of the German faith of today are already founded here": "the free, noble, beautiful soul" is not connected to anyone, neither God nor human nor even something like the church, except only their blood, their race. Even with Master Eckart, it celebrates its happy origins from the hard times of Syrian-African-Roman coercion and dark forces. This soul has emerged and is therefore bound to its species-specific inheritance and blood, religiously oriented downwards, to the deep biological foundations of its existence. This soul carries within itself "the original opposites of consciousness", the eternal polarity of existence" (p. 243). Nature grants — freedom, which — Nature (p. 231), which is part of all the objective world God expresses.

For Eckart and with it all Nordic attitudes, God is now just an unavoidable "idea", a kind of postulate in the Kantian sense that we need in order to become aware of the underlying elements of our existence and to be able to grasp them conceptually in some way. That's how it is the Lord God is just a product of our soul, "created by it as a new object" (p. 222). This soul proclaims its "equivalence" to this God in self-aggrandizing autonomy, in freedom and honor (ibid.). This liberalism of Eckart's soul should therefore increase to the point of a "democratic" claim to equality with her God, which - mind you - she created herself and which she only uses to get along in the deconomy of her metaphysical household.

Eckart copied even more from Kant. God is nothing other than the "religious" paraphrase of the epistemological boundary concept of the thing in itself. Yes, Eckart should see space and space, the concepts of cause and effect, as nothing other than mere forms of order that are necessary to deal with the pressing material of appearance (p. 222). Eckart does not shy away from "joyfully and openly calling out" this basic confession of all Aryan beings", "this German religion" (p. 254) into the world of dogmas, "Church and Popes" (p. 222), with its Roman-Latin grafting" (p. 255) and its highest values "love, humility and mercy" (p. 233).

However, it is not entirely true when "the noble Geele" (p. 232) "of the heretic Eckart" (p. 223) with her not only characteristic but essential values of "honor and freedom"

(p. 218), when this greatest apostle of the Nordic evening-landes" (p. 218), he seems so averse to Marthrium, which he actually takes for granted, that he does not attack Rome "in the open" but only in the "pictorial "Presenting mental experiences positively" (p. 233) suffices his mission. A similar ambiguity also surrounds "venerable Thomas Aquino", as it is called on p. 242, but on p. 255 he has already clearly gone out of his way and deserted.

These leaps in valuation would hardly be of any importance if they were not the result of a completely misguided basic attitude. It takes revenge at every turn that R. transfers his world view, his religion of blood, onto that high authority whose understanding should never be possible for such an anti-Roman effect. *Idem eodem cognoscitur*, the same is known only through the same. This old Aristotelian-Thomistic axiom of knowledge also applies to the intellectual history of the Middle Ages. You still have to have a piece of the Middle Ages. Have truly Catholic mysticism in your heart in order to be able to understand this great phenomenon of German Catholicity. But it is completely wrong to judge Eckart by this worldview of today, to which the Frenchman Gobineau and the Englishman Chamberlain contributed everything essential in the 19th century, and to which some Kantian idealism was poorly mixed. The genetic understanding of history takes on a historical appearance not through a more or less affective decline from today, but only through methodical and prudent use at a far more preliminary level. And so here too.

The phenomenon of Eckartian mysticism wants to be built into the great ancient-medieval tradition, into the stream of that *philosophia perennis* (persistent philosophy) that wells up in Plato-Aristotle in order to build up beyond Augustine's Neo-Platonism in the great creations of thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. Anyone who removes Eckart from this world and makes him an inconvenience to today's opinions and factions with all their unpleasant resentments and poorly disguised tendencies certainly does not have the clear and unclouded view that is necessary to delve into the subtleties and delicate filigree of Eckart's speculation to calmly delve deeper. Master Eckart himself once said that his teaching was "strange, difficult and meaningless" (*rara, difficilis, subtilis*) and that it was only accessible to an "understood and pious (*pie et sane*) mind" (Daniels: *Defensorium* p. 2 etc. 34) So one has to take it from the deep religiosity of the Middle Ages, its speculative power, its gigantic ancient-Christian cultural balance, the reception of Aristotle, the ever-growing Neoplatonism, from Patristic, but above all from the biblical source writings, from Ultem and New Testament, especially from Pauline-Augustinian "existential theology", but certainly not from the epistemological-critical-racial-biological ideas of the 19th century. One should also consider the strict bondage of the Middle Ages to precisely those authorities whose ideas one only dares to explain, but hardly further develop, unless in the friendly interpretation through which, for example, B. St. Thomas the great Augustine secretly reinterprets. In the Middle Ages only a spirit that drank its fill of those timeless springs had that

Right to produce yourself. People rightly feared mental idleness too early, which is why one had to have acquired something in order to possess something. We are happy to avoid cheap subjectivity. The liberalism of a "solely free knowledge of reason", as R. (p. 254) suggested to our master, was completely unknown. One did not reject it from a healthy and universal mental attitude, even without first - like us should have had the experiences of the 19th century.

en,

So the traditional authorities of Master Eckart, over whom one almost stumbles in his writings, may be mentioned above: Plato, Aristotle, Proclus, Dionysius, Cicero, Horace, Seneca, Avicenna, Uvencebrol, the "liber de causis" (the book about the causes), Moses Maimonides, Origines, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Johannes Damascenus, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Boetius, Bernard of Clairveaux, Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, Petrus Lombardus, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas: None of them probably thought about transcendental idealism or modern racial theories.

It must be explicitly stated that a very important part of Eckart's writing is dedicated to the explanation of the Bible. The explanation of the 30 Gospel of Hannes was almost the master's literary "favorite child." If R., on the other hand, can state that he did not refer to church teachings, or even the Bible (like Luther later did)" (p. 254), So this is just noted here as a curiosity. An external sign of Master Eckart's high intellectual origins is the Latin language, to which almost nine parts of his writings belong. With all his creative linguistic power, with which the preacher Eckart touched the hearts of his German listeners and made his mother tongue submissive to the most brittle abstractions in order to catch up with them vividly, colorfully and flutteringly, we should not forget that he also spoke to the universal language of Rome as powerful as he was in his native language. It is methodological sin when R. bases his Eckart interpretation, quite apart from its day-to-day circumstances, solely on the master's German sermons and treatises. What's more, he doesn't even refer to the original Middle High German of Pfeiffer's edition, but to all the arbitrariness and interpretative art of a translation, namely Büttner's. But that's not enough: Even the original text, as published by Pfeiffer, is extremely corrupt. Only recently, the Bonn Germanist I. Quint published a text review entitled: The transmission of Master Eckart's German sermons. Bonn 1932. Not only are Büttner's worst errors of meaning shown here, but the textual inadequacies of his original have also been eliminated. Without Quint's improvement, achieved with all the means of modern translation, Pfeiffer's edition, much more so Büttner's translation, is useless. We still haven't come close to the original meaning that Master Eckart wanted his sermons to have. Because this improved text is also a sermon transcript with all the interpretation and memory errors of the transcriptionist, and not a stenographic record. Master Eckart himself says of those postscripts that they are distorted and false (dimi-

— a

nute et falso), just as mere audio reports are reproduced later. (Que audiunt, reportantur) (Daniels 12).

Anyone who wants the truth can never do without the truly original Eckart manuscripts - and these are only the Latin ones - the exactness and generality of their scholastic conceptual language. If we summarize, it is the tendentious pragmatism that Eckart uses as interesting evidence for a contemporary worldview and thus robs him of his actual character. Then the disregard of the essential Latin literature is the second serious issue that questions R.'s Eckart interpretation from a purely methodological point of view.

In the following, the inner, factual impossibility of R.'s interpretation, the one-sidedness and the incoherent picking up of appropriate gizmos and thought fragments will be demonstrated. We divide it into three sections:

1. the relationship between God and man, 2. Master Eckart's "highest values" ("honor and freedom"), 3. his relationship to the church.

Civil section

Relationship between God and man

a) Your identity

According to R., "the popular explanation of the Mystit'... always just giving up, throwing yourself away to God and sees this in this self-giving to another essence of mystical experience". Of course, as always, there is Rome guilty, because "this way of looking at it is through the Roman falsified late mysticism is understandable, it comes from further the seemingly ineradicable attitude as if I were and God essentially different." "But who Ekart as one If you have understood wholeness, you will easily notice that this devotion is in reality the highest self-confidence, but that doesn't look any different in this world than through a counterpart in prayer and space. The teaching from the soul, which is more than the universe and is also free from it God (!), and the doctrine of separateness mean a complete rejection of the Old Testament imagination world and the sweet aftermysticism of later times" (all Quotes p. 223).

That's quite a lot at once. Because here Eckart is transformed into nothing other than a liberal Prometheus of the 19th century, whose cries of "Go-bon-God" or "Go-from-Rome" take a worrying view of today's world. In addition, according to R., we are forced to give our dear self the as-if character of a divine counterpart in this world of space and presence.

Because otherwise we would be completely incomprehensible. M.a. W., in order to be able to somehow get hold of ourselves, we give ourselves a good God in whose objectivity we reflect our liberal self. We, on the other hand, heard: You shall not make a graven image for yourself, not even in your consciousness! So here God is just a Ms-ob symbol of our free self-consciousness. Note how closely this interpretation corresponds to the intellectual heights of German idealism, for example. B. has sunk and reduced the good master Edart, the Dominican prior of the 14th century, to a positivist forerunner of Mr. Vaihinger and his Ms. ob philosophy. Because we are already miles away from Kant here, since his ethos was not yet able to completely do without the Lord God as a reality.

What is R.'s grotesque interpretation based on? Mainly the following passage, of course with Büttner's oversight, which is worth recording here in its entirety. The blocking bold comes from R.)

"I am the cause of myself, according to my eternal and temporal nature. This is the only reason I was born. According to my eternal manner of birth, I have been from eternity and am and will remain forever. Only what I am as a temporal being will die and come to nothing, because it belongs to the day; therefore it must disappear like time. In my birth all things were born; I was at the same time the cause of myself and of all things. And I wished: neither I was nor all things. But if I weren't, then God wouldn't be either" (p. 225).

Now the regular misfortune happens to those who, — as in this case, only buy second hand. The passage is completely mistranslated, with obstructions that distort the meaning, so that Quint a. a. D. S. 789 has to explain: "The translations by Büttner and Lehmann are completely meaningless, which make the nonsense of their translations even worse by blocking them." R.'s striking interpretation is based quite significantly on such a passage. Yes, he even leaves Eckart with one "Magnificent gesture" for this notorious nonsense from Messrs. Büttner-Lehmann "to call out to the world" (!!)

(R. p. 225). Instead, following Quint's text correction, Edart may have initially — sermon to his listeners, albeit without the preached the — emotional pathos of a protester Pfeiffer's text in corrected revolutionary the original, because it is precisely on this spiritual idea of all mysticism that the accusation of a subjective pantheism all too often.)

"Wan min essential being is above whether God so, as we got nemen a beginning of the creatures (bold words from us!), van in the same being of God, since God is above all beings and above undercut, there something I myself and here around I am in the same way according to my nature, that is eternal, and not according to my becoming, that is mortal, and here around I am unborn, and according to my unborn way I will never die. According to my unborn vision, I was like that and now I'm still the same. Because I was born that I should die and never die when it is

deadly, and if I wanted to, I didn't want it, I didn't want it, and I didn't want it, so I didn't have it: if God is God, that's one thing for me. If I don't get anything, then I don't get anything." This is what Pfeiffer says in an improved version, pp. 283, 38 in the review:

"My essential being is above God, insofar as we understand him as the beginning of all creation. In the same divine entity, where God is before all beings and above all difference, there was I myself. Therefore I am the cause of myself according to my essence, which is eternal, but not according to my becoming, which is temporal. Therefore I am unborn and according to my unborn way of being I can never die. According to my unborn manner, I am eternally alive, I am both ever and everlasting. Whatever I am as a result of my birth shall die and become nothing, for it is fatal. And if I had wished that I were not, and if I were not, God would not be. I am a cause of God being God. If it weren't for me, God wouldn't be God."

Now the meaning of this idea emerges, which, in its deliberate baradocy, wants to say the secrets of the ineffable precisely by not saying them, i.e. i. Parador, says, as thoroughly "harmless"-traditional. It is Plato's old teaching of the *eidos aïdeon*, the Augustinian-Thomistic idea *exemplaris*, the *ratio aeterna*, the universal *ante rem*, *daz borgewürket dinc*" (Pf. p. 487, 40) Master Edarts, the original form of things, which God's infinitely creative intellect carries within itself in an exemplary manner, and according to whose measure his creative will subsequently places the creatures into existence.

So can e.g. B. Meister Eckart say: God has minned all the saints he has provided for them, *e diu world would*" (Pf. p. 488, 6). And as God the
When he created creatures in time, no new will arose in him,
for when the creature was not in itself, as now, it existed
(*ewelten*) before the world beginning in *gote* and *siner* reason" (Pf. p. 488, 18).
And if he also this ideal creature in and with the bending of his divine
If a son gives birth (an old patristic-scholastic idea), he must give
in form *belibende* in *im* itself, in which form *daz* form, therefore as *ez* is eternal
been in *ime*, (*formae illius*) *daz* is *sin forme* *belibende* in *im* itself, like that
he must give birth to the image that remains within himself, that image in the original
reason, as it has always existed in him (its forms) *d. i.* whose shape,
remaining in himself." In him, in his firstness (*firstezeit*), in his
Innermost", in His "foundation", in the "far away of prayerfulness", in His
some a", "Hie sint alliu grasbleteln and wood and stone and alliu dinc a"
(Pf. p. 332, 30 f.). Truly, this mystery of our God-intimateness
according to which we and all creation are the eternal dream of the infinite, that is
large. And from Plato, Aristotle to Augustine and Thomas, the whole thing
great choir of thinkers and men of God, consistently free of their pagan
Adventist or Christian-filled thinking around this fullness of the divine,
that lives within us. How much more must the increased divinity of the
Mystic glows at this point of unity of belief and knowledge, that
Dabon Edart may say: "This is the best of all and I think about it."
töret" (I became drunk and foolish because of all this!) (Pf. pp. 332, 40).

For this exemplary archetype of ourselves in God is at the same time God, God himself, despite the absolute simplicity of his essence. In this respect, through our eternal existence in the mind of God, we are God himself. "The divine essence is the peculiar model image of every thing, precisely through the ideal source of this thing, which God's essence always holds with itself," says St. Thomas in *De veritate* VIII, 8 ad 1.

In this divine essence we have eternity according to our original image. In this respect, we "enliven" and "illuminate" ourselves, namely our earthly, time-dependent existence from our previous, eternal existence in the bosom of God. So in a certain sense we are actually the cause of ourselves.

For the original reasons of the creature in the spirit of God are light and life (*lux et vita*!) Life, insofar as they go out to bring things into the world, just as the artistic form image *Hintvill* into art, but light: insofar as those are similar "Produce embossed forms in the (created) Scistern" (Thomas: *ibid.* VIII, 8th Corp.).

And Master Edart, with a slight variation of our current punctuation, finds the Johannine word thus: *Quod factum est, in Ipso vita erat*, what was made, in Him it was already life (John 1, 3).

Based on these great ideas of the Christian tradition, is it heresy and pantheistic "wanting to be like God" when Master Edart says in the above place that I am conceptually earlier than God's creation of the world in terms of my essence, i.e. my ideal form determined in God? I didn't have to from eternity I was first seen in God's intellect before his infinite will created me?! Or in other words: My eternal original form, my "eternal I" is God's being, and all being is conceptually prior to his actions. *Agere sequitur esse*, action follows being. So my eternal self, or „the deity that ideally destroys me, is the cause of my temporal existence. If she or "I" (in this sense!) had not accomplished the temporal existence, my real self, and with it all earthly creatures , of course) God would then not be what we should understand him to be according to the Edartian introduction: namely, as the creator of the world, as the "begin of the creatures".

Insofar as my eternal archetype in God's eternal vision creates its "exuding goodness" (*diffusivum sui*), I am the cause of my earthly self as well as that of God's real creativity.

This natural unity of ours with God, how much does it increase for the Christian mystic, who knows that he is immersed in the supernatural streams of grace which, through Christ's mediation, now also unite God and man down here. If I was the cause of God as the Creator there, I am now the cause of God as the Redeemer. In both cases I am able to "coerce" him, to "force" him (a real mystic idea!), precisely because his goodness, his eternal love wants to be conquered, since it is their desire to be with the children of men; yes, because God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son . . .

Truly, Angelus Silesius is right: Without me, in my eternal "preparedness" (which is God himself!), without me in my "creation", without me in my "redemption"... God would not be God without me "not to live a single moment". But not as if he were limited by this, but precisely because he is so limitless, so completely limitless in his

Love. Deus autem caritas, Master Edart and whoever is not is lost in their depths...

And that's why it's wrong when R. (p. 257) lets the mystic say in God's glory: "Who is like me?", because he always humbly and devoutly confesses: Who is like him, quis sicut deus, the one like that gave power to people?

For the mystic, love is above all else: be it in its fulfillment in practice or in its passion and movement here. So those Christian roots of St. Paul appear again and again in Edart's writings. Take all those thoughts from before wonderfully forward, such as: B. Roman VIII, 28: "For those whom he foreknew he also ordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he himself might be the firstborn among many brethren." Or: "From him, through him, in him are all things." Roman XI, 36. Or: "You are Christ's body, member by member." I Cor. XII, 27. Live, but not I, but Christ lives in me." Gal. II, 20. "Christ is my life." Phil. I, 21. God all in all." 1 Cor. Our heart is restless until it rests in You, O God.

Mysticism is a primal phenomenon of Christianity, founded in that saying of the Savior that Edart repeats again and again: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength, with all your mind." Luk. X, 27. "Minne dinen got with all my heart", "love with all the joys of the soul" (Pf. p. 489, 9 Daniels:

p. 19). This mystical, loving union with Christ now takes place in of grace; With the entire Scholastic, Master Edart finds that specifically catholic teaching according to which grace presupposes nature but does not abolish it. All creation is ordered to him for the work of grace and rebirth" (Daniels, p. 40/45).

But this birth of God only took place in the redeemed human soul. No creature is susceptible to this birth, because only the soul... all perfection, light and happiness must necessarily come into the soul with this birth, in a fine way otherwise" (Pf. IX, 39). "Now the soul is after God formed, it is transformed by God in God" (Pf. p. 401, 16).

Here we are basically in Eckart's mysticism, where he talks about St. Thomas also consciously draws on the "slavish half-African" Augustine in order to build a transcendental doctrine of grace. He applies the Platonic-Augustinian concept of "participation" to the two basic concepts of transcendentality, namely esse and *bas unum*, the common and the unity. And if, in the natural realm, our being and the unity that is invertible to it signify some concern for these infinite peculiarities of God, this is even more the case in the supernatural realm of being. According to Eckart, grace is not some *donum creatum* (finite gift) of a habitual nature to the soul, but rather grace brings its divine or god-like being, analogous to the natural creation of man, which here is only continued, transferred.

is formed. Grace is not something created, but etivas something uncreated, insofar as we participate in divine being, which thus blossoms as a "participant" in our soul. Grace is the godlikeness, the divinity, the eternal in man. It is the miracle of the light that The mystic has to illustrate these highest processes so often and protects him from pantheistic derailments.

So for him grace is an "outflowing light" (Pf. pp. 404, 34), a parable that finds its delicious expression in the following words: "I take a basin of water, put a mirror in it and put it under the circle the sun. It then throws its bright light out of its round and deep base and yet never disappears. The mirror's reflection in the sun, that is in the sun. It is the sun and yet what it is. So it is with God. God is in the soul with his nature, with his essence, with his deity, and yet he is not the soul. The contradiction of the Geele, it is in God. God is it, and yet what it is" (Pf. p. 180, 34).

The ray of God's sun in the drops of the soul. And just as this sun is completely sunlit, yes, it is a sun, it "participates" in it, and in this part the entire image of the sun is reflected, so our soul also behaves in the shimmer of the infinite. And like thousands and thousands of drops "part "- take the sun, and everyone owns it completely, the majesty of the sun remains completely within itself and untouched. And as the sunny morning dew relates to it, so does the blessed soul relate to God.

If this parable of the divinity of the blessed soul is taken from nature, the supernatural also offers in the mystery of the transformation of the essence of the thousand figures of bread into the one, whole, undivided Corpus Christi of ours Mr. an analogue (Daniel, p. 54).

About all these concepts and views there is only a parable, a sicut (a well), and even more, a sicutissimum (ibid.). What remains is: "My being, it comes from God's being, but only in an analogous way" (Daniels, p. 52). It is not the image of God (that is only Christ), but formed in the image (Daniels, p. 17 and 54).

This gracious transformation, this change, can of course not take place in the soul's forces: understanding and will, but only in the supporting ground of being of the soul itself. For God only gives himself to the understanding as truth, to the will as goodness and to its supporting ground as being itself (the "ipsum esse"). Grace therefore means slipping away of God into the naked ground of being of our soul (deus ingreditur et illa-bitur nude essentiae animae). This is how it brings our "I" ("ego")

Dan. pp. 59, 32) the super-sensibility of the same thing, that over al sunder-come (Pf. p. 375, 10), the sele above itself" (Pf. p. 377, 17). (From here there are obviously parallels in the thinking of Eckart and Erich Przhwara. Troß R., p. 244 f.)

This is how we understand Eckart's transformation of Paul's words: "Through the grace of God I am, not what, but that I am."

God is the Gein, his essence, his essence is the Gein; every creature has being, essence and existence are actually different. That's why creating for God means bringing essence and existence together (collatio esse), while in God himself both are deeply entwined in the "one" of identity.

are. Our being is a received Gein (receptum esse), God's being, the Gein itself (ipsum esse) (Daniels p. 45 and p. 28).

If we now take part in God's grace in his grace, we also take part in that second transcendental characteristic of God: his unity. "The humble man" and God are no longer civil, but one" (Dan. G. 39). Creature is multiplicity, Bahl, but God is one, without one (namely number!) and beyond all number (supra numerum). It itself cannot be put into a numerical relationship with anything. (Where is R.'s teaching about the polarity or duality of all existence?! Cf. Dan. p. 57.) So we too are separated by grace from all the divine diversity, from all the randomness of this world (Pf. S . 486, 25). We are "convulsed" (Pf. p. 486, 29) "into eternity, dead to the world, we no longer taste what is earthly." For Christ lives in us - as Paul says" (ibid.). So I am receptive to nothing but God" (Pf. p. 484, 26). We certainly understand Edart's demand: Keep yourself separated from all people... Free yourself from everything that could give your being a strange butt... For it is the seclusion of all creatures" (Pf. p. 484, 29). . R. turns this into a "Bölkish confession" (R. p. 235). If you don't lay it out, put something underneath...

In our seclusion, God's simplicity is reflected, because as he is „one and unique, he (God!) infuses into this that I heat up there, a 'burgher', in the soul" (Pf. p. 46, 40) .

All naming cannot express this "simplicity" of our soul, this being-in-God, it would only have to fragment it here. The blessed soul as such, participating in God's unheard-of in-itself, is without a name, without an image, without external form. Est sibi ipsi, it is here only for itself, so much reason and meaning that it does not even reflect itself in self-consciousness. For in it lives

God, the simplicity, that "baltic one". Edart probably got this gifted, folded, nameless soul center following Luke, documented (see Dan. p. 59). Whether he borrowed the term (custodia) surveillance from Thomas' De veritate p. 24, 9 corp seems questionable. But it has become clear to everyone how wrong it is to describe

Eckart's concept of the little five, the castle fortress, as the "metaphysical parable of the ideas of honor and freedom" (R. p. 218), yes, how grotesque it must seem, Eckart here so etivas such as the "unconcern of the soul towards everything, including God", to even consider letting him see, with ever new astonished admiration, the "innermost, barest and most rigid nature of our race" (ibid.).

b) Difference between God and man

Despite all the "identity" of God and man in grace, Master Edart also emphasizes the infinite distance between the two. The most essential difference, however, is that between God as being itself and the creature as being from the other (ens a se ens ab — alio). To be a creature means that

"Being received from nothing" (Dan. p. 56). Mjo "from itself the creature is a pure nothing". Edart keeps hammering this, nad) R. (p. 248) almost "crazy" idea into us again and again (cf. e.g. Dan.: pp. 34, 39, 50, 56, 57 etc.).

If we are created, from the self a nothing, then God, the Creator, is the One and the Me. Creature means: "receiving being from nothing," and creator: "giving being from nothing" (Dan. p. 28). So if the creator only finds pure nothingness outside himself and has to take all being from himself, yes, then he is the cause of causes, the *causa prima et universalis*, the first and primary cause" (Dan. *ibid.*). It goes on to say : God is being and the immediate (!) cause of all being (Dan. p. 57). Mind you, the immediate one, which does not presuppose any medium! Got git sinen works forme and matter (1) bon nihte: des vermac diu sele nihte " (Pf. p. 529, 9).

R. alone discovered that Master Edart had directed himself against this "Judeo-Roman doctrine" with its creation of the world from nothing. Yes, he thinks: "The Germanic spirit has always been in fierce battle against this monstrous basic doctrine (1). - stood by" (R. p. 249).

R. further assumes: "The Germanic spirit knows nothingness not. "He only knows about a wave, a chaos, he only thinks for a moment of a folder from the outside." We couldn't respond to him more effectively than Master Edart when he replies to his incomprehensible people from then and now: " But Moses (1) said that God created heaven and earth in the very first beginning, in which God himself is without any medium" (Dan. p. 29). It gets even stronger: Master Eckart himself accuses his opponents of heresy, mental weakness (*imbecillitas intellectus*) and malevolence (*malicia*), because they did not teach the complete nullity of the creature, but at least considered it to be some kind of *Etivas* (*quid modicum*) (Dan . p. 34). (Similar to *Sat-pientia* commentary, by Chérh ed., p. 278).

So Master Edart transferred one to Kant. R. "a form of view (causality) that is only valid for this world in the metaphysical area", namely to God (R. p. 249). And when the Roman Church in this question "leads to the fight for its existence, the creation dogma "as the If they stubbornly defended their "presupposition of their position as representatives of the Creator" (*ibid.*), then Master Edart was one of their best fighters. In any case, for him God is the fullness of being, the creatures are a "luter niht". I don't say that they are little sins or that they are (something): they are not a loud thing" (Pf. pp. 136, 23).

c) The analogy

So all creatures stand in the midst of the tension between being and nothingness, the forces of height and life. But that is the doctrine of *analogia entis* (analogy of being). Master Edart has fully committed himself to her. The whole contradiction of this paradoxical world situation of ours

he expressed it in ever new dialectical phrases. Depending on the difference in point of view, because this is dialectics, depending on whether our thinking approaches the creature from above, from God, or from below, from nothing, the antitheses arise. "If you sit one creature against another, it appears beautiful and is something, but if you put it against God, then it is nothing" (Pf. pp. 222, 34). Eckart now makes use of this dialectic of analogia entis Quite traditional way. The creature is both existing (from God, as created) and at the same time non-existent (because from below, from itself a nothing), it is similar and dissimilar to God (for the same reasons). God touches all things (as creator and constant maintainer) and does not touch them (for he himself remains untouched). He is in all things (as image and cause) and above all things (because self-sufficient, infinitely simple). (cf. Karrer, p 81, also Pf. pp. 613, 15; 96, 23.) Finally, Eckart leads all antitheses back to the one, traditional one:

"St. Augustine says: All things are God,
St. Dionysius says: All things are nothing!"

(Pf. p. 531, 6 and 8.)

In this way, Eckart places himself in the great Christian tradition of thought, especially in his teaching of analogy, and focuses on that "middle" that is the characteristic of Christian wisdom. "Our faith-based thinking follows the middle path," says Thomas de veritate XXIV, 12 .corp. This central character of the analogia entis, which spans the opposites not over but into one, results directly from the statement that God made the world out of nothing. This sentence is the simple but germinal root of all those surprising conclusions that every child could draw. Isn't it just the truth?...

How wrong, on the other hand, to attribute this envied central character of our teaching, which always anticipates all old and modern one-sidedness in its true core, to an agile mismatch and a constant borrowing of ideas, as R. would like it to be true (R. p. 245 ff.). "Rome has never subsequently incorporated" (p. 247), but heretics have previously incorporated themselves out of that organic seedbed of the "simply true." Of course, this organic center of our religious thinking will continue to unfold, develop into living times, but that is the difference is not from the outside in, as a compromise and hasty addition of modern extremes, but the other way around: quietly and steadily, from the inside out, it will blossom. This is because our truth is rooted in the sun of the eternal and not in the storm of the Pray that it is rooted in being and not in nothingness, in God and not in man. "When we are not you, you are the truth and therefore God changes our knowledge and we are not, when he is you the truth and we are not" (Pf. pp. 418, 15).

Let our opponents "explain" this truth of the middle, of the binding analogy of addition and compromising combination of what is borrowed here and there. How could they otherwise! For them, all truth is only in time, and in general only insofar as it practical utility value for today and its needs. One refers to a misunderstood Goethe: "Whatever is fruitful, alone is true" (R.

'S. 238). For us, on the other hand, "diu einbeltic luter weselichiu truth" (Pf. pp. 272, 30), the simple, pure essential truth, is super-useful, supernatural and super-timely, since it is "got alone" (ibid.). The analogia entis with all its richness of tension is the structural formula for creaturely existence. It is in no way applicable to God himself. He is infinite and ineffable beyond all creation, "he is," says Eckart, "above all names, above understanding and reason, above beings and beings" (Karrer p. 65). "His essence is self-sufficient, i.e. H.: He does not need anything outside of himself for his perfection: I am who I am" (Karrer ebenda; see Pf. p. 403, 23). "Nothing, the shadowy being, needs being like the sick person needs health needs - not the health of the sick" (Karrer p. 66).

This absoluteness of God naturally turns into an absurdity so etivas vie an eternal polarity of existence", the 3 multiplicity as the basic law of all existence" (R. p. 243/44), "the polarity of life recognized even in the deepest depths of all seclusion" (R. p. 230). . Says Eckart, and with this we want to conclude the doctrine of analogy: "When God created heaven and earth and all creatures, that was of little concern to his immobile seclusion, as if he had never created the creatures" (Pf. S. 487, 13).

Third section

Master Eckart's highest values

"The freedom of Geele is a value in itself. The church values of love, humility, mercy, grace, etc. merely mean something in relation to a moment that lies outside them" (R. p. 238), (apart from the unfortunate terminology "value in itself!" - is also the idea wrong. Freedom, as a freedom from... and a freedom for what... is always a relational concept, because that is what R. means.) He continues: "The nobility, of the soul left on its own, is therefore the very highest, you Man alone has to serve; we today will call it the deepest metaphysical root of the idea of honor, which is also an idea in itself (!), i.e. without any reference to any other value" (R. ibid.) . One should note the latter: without any bezid..., because in the immediately following sentence it is said without concern: "The idea of freedom cannot be thought of without honor. This in turn is not possible without freedom. The soul does good things itself, without any relationship to God (!), teaches Edart, etc. With this, Master Eckartal shows himself to be the creator of a new religion" (R. p. 239).

One really doesn't know whether one should be more surprised by the conceptual confusion of the first sentences or the dashing boldness of the last sentences.

In any case, it will be difficult to go into these theses in more detail after what we had to say in Chapter II.

It is in itself a risk to apply the modern, more or less subjectivist concept of value to the philosophy of the Middle Ages. But there can be no serious doubt about this: the highest value, "the best good" (Pf. p. 374, 27), "all vollkommenheit zemale undivided: that is in got alone" (ibid. p. 6).

All freedom, all "creative creativity" of man, who alone can determine himself as a member of all creatures, become his own cause (causa sui), all of this only acquires meaning and content when it reaches that infinite primal good, the eternal goodness God. All purely formal freedom, freedom simply for the sake of freedom, this purely formal conception clearly has in the background the old "non serviam", I do not want to serve. This is the case with Kant and all his descendants. Our formal freedom is nothing if it does not have its meaning or meaning. finds its form in the material goodness of God. To be free from all creatures, especially our self and all our own being (tolle quod tuum est, Dan. 49, put away all characteristics! Pf. p. 155, 20), in order to be free for the highest good, free from the finite part, to become free for the infinite whole, that is the meaning of Christian-Eckartian freedom. The spirit, which is completely free, has as its content all being" (Karrer 6. 142), 6. 1. God. This results in the Christian paradox: The human being is the most free who does the will of God; the human being is the freest, the most noble, and at the same time the most humble. "He should be the most free, he forgets his selfhood and flows with everything that he is into the bottomless abyss of his origin. But this belongs to all voluntarily poor people who have sunk into the valley of humility. They actually follow the words that our Lord speaks: Whoever wants to come to me, let him lift up his cross and follow me (Pf. p. 393, 23 ff.). The highest freedom is the highest humility, and above both shines the cross of our redemption, i.e. our liberation from sin for the freedom of the children of God.

Now we understand that Master Eckart must see the essence of all sin in that liberal individualism of "the soul left on its own". "Every sin is sin because it is pride and so violates the commandment of God. Like humility "The most real preparation is for every grace, so pride is the direct opposite of grace and therefore the root and, so to speak, general form of all vices, just as love is the form of all virtues, to the extent that any virtue without love would be a kind of vice" (Karrer, p. 97).

"Superbia - caput et causa omnium delictorum", "the head of pride and the cause of all sin" - that is the through-baied idea of Augustine's theocracy. "Caritas forma omnium virtutum" "love is the form of all those who move," answers him Thomas just as often. — Das

But R. states in contrast: Eckart finds that the highest values of the Christian church, love, humility... have heights and depths and greatness must give way to the state of Gele left on their own" (R. p. 233). Love is the highest, the fulfillment of which is found in the unio mystica, in God's gracious intrusion into our soul. "Deus est caritas" again and again sounds in Eckart this Johannes-

word up. How wrong when R. makes a "gloriously aristocratic confession" out of Eckart's words: "Now listen to how the soul becomes God, even above grace. What God has bestowed on it should not change again, because She has thus reached a higher level where she no longer needs grace" (R. p. 237, letter p. 386, 39).

Well, of course not, because at this point Eckart speaks of a "passing of the soul from one nobleness to the other at the hour when it separates from the body, where at the same moment eternal life is opened to it and it is in the scope of of divine light is drawn and formed in God." And God, to whom she is ever united in eternal love, has "good nature" what she possessed here below "in graces" (Bf. p. 382, 9). And of course he needs no longer of mediating grace, which, above the earthly state of grace, has God directly in eternal love and uniformity. Grace, as we have it in this life, and bliss, as we will one day have it in the eternal life, are related to each other like the blossom fruit" (Pf. p. 323, 5). "The soul should rise in grace and mature to perfection and should rise above grace: for then it sees God" (Pf. p. 140, 1).

Love holds exactly the place in Eckart that it has in Christian thought and action belongs, namely to the very first. "Love never falls away,

Prophecies will also cease or knowledge will pass over, because Stüdwerk is our knowledge..." But now these three remain, faith, hope, love, but the greatest of these is love" (Cor. XIII, 8-13). This Thoughts of St. Paul was taken up by all the teachers of the church. So is According to Thomas, our love is superior to knowledge when it comes to God.

Because we can only recognize the Lord God as he appears to us imprinted indirectly on weak minds, but they are allowed to love him just as he above-half of our weak knowledge in ourselves (Thom, De veritate XXII, 11th Corp.). But loving God, according to Thomistic teaching, means giving him our will turn, 8th h. our rational, ambitious ability (appetitus intellectivus), that with the intellectus appetitiveus, with the will-bound mind, as the only other partner, the sensible end of our soul's resources makes up. The organic connection between reason and will, as the spiritual potencies of our soul, in their representation, is part of the experience Have what scholastic philosophy has to say. In any case: common sense and will alone constitute spiritual potency.

When Master Eckart explains from this tradition that "love falls entirely into the will" and that "whoever has more will also has more love" (Pf. 553, 17/R. p. 242), this is not the opposite of the teachings of "the Roman clergy" (R. ibid), but exactly the same thing. And not to forget it: the "sclabian half-African" Augustine behaves just as voluntaristically (cf. De trinitate: 15, 38; De civitate dei, 12, 9. 14, 7). So it remains a given that all feeling in our sense, all passions and sentimentalities, whose calculating cult R. is too fond of Catholicism, are expelled from the spiritual sphere. And as is well known, according to St. Paul, the Catholic practice of salvation is to encourage people to live in the spirit, to walk in the spirit" (Gal. 5:25). "For the flesh lusts against the spirit, but the spirit resists the flesh" (Gal. 5:17).

But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, gentleness, goodness, longsuffering, meekness, faith, modesty, temperance, chastity" (Gal. 5:22).

From this we feel the intellectualism of the Pauline-Thomistic mentality

Our current noisy affective life could really learn a lot.

And if you're up against it, it's more sexual and psychological

"Ecstasy" where the Church brings love "with a well-considered approach
"hypnotization method" (R. p. 241), it seems to us,

that here, if there is a spiritual faculty, then certainly not reason,

but only the will spoke. This love

for God is opposed by the sin to which we "Franken liute" (Pf.

p. 10, 25), not we "free, noble souls" in our physical birth, have

fallen through original sin. And only the spiritual birth brings us

from sin to grace". How does R. reconcile "the Nordic man

Edart, who judges based on a flared soul instinct" (R. p.

236) with his almost Mosaic-Jewish rigorism when it says: "The first

birth brings children of the born herbor. If a person dies in the

first birth , then he would be condemned. The first birth brings

a person into the world guilty as a child of the evil enemy" (Pf. p.

369 ff.). And does it testify to an unwavering consciousness

of freedom" (R. p. 225), to an "imperious will in

the best sense" (ibid. p. 241), if original sin in human nature in

general, as it comes from the first parents, has a corrupting effect, if There

is contradiction and struggle in our sensual sphere, division and

separation, disunity and bitterness" (Karrer, p. 96). Paul says that "body

and flesh always oppose the spirit, that one should help the

spirit must come in his banishment and break the flesh in this conflict..."

(Pf. p. 29, 17 ff.). And does the German faith also want to

adopt the harsh teachings of its supposedly first "uppost" when it says,

with explicit reference to St. Augustine: "Mortal sin is a defect of

nature, a dying of the soul, a restlessness of the heart, an infirmity

of the powers, a blindness of the understanding, a misery for the

mind, a death of all good works, an error of the spirit, a fellowship of

the devil, an exclusion from Christianity, a fellow of hell" (Pf. pp.

216, 26; cf . also Pf. pp. 217, 3; 277, 13).

In this way, in the face of sin, the entire questionability of our

nature is revealed to our Master, which also shadows into the kingdom of

grace and redemption. For Christ has freed us from original sin, because

it corrupts nature, but not from actual sin, which refers to the Berjon

in us and corrupts it" (Dan. p. 48).

But Master Edart does not get stuck in negation, because sin also has

its deep meaning in the divine world and salvation plan. When he goes

on to say that "having sinned is not a sin as soon as we are sorry," this

is the self-evident premise with which every Catholic goes to confession, both

yesterday and today. But Edart does not mean to take us miles away

from the usual requirement *Beririchung*" (R. p. 237),

because the master makes the teaching of the fathers of the *donum lacrimarum*

with reference to Mary Magdalene and St. Peter expressly owns it.

"It is a confession of great love, where the tears are filled with remorse

and whoever has repentance for their sins because of hardship, it is basically good that repentance is washed with wheat" (Pf. p. 362, 36; 363, 1).

Likewise, Edart's word "against sin" is an early Christian one. We remember Paul's saying: "Where sin abounded, grace abounded" (Rom. 5:20), which was used by St. Augustine continues when he speaks of the "felix culpa," the happy guilt," which brought us the Savior with all his richness of love. And sin still has meaning in the life of the individual. St. Augustine says: "For those who love God, he turns everything into something good, in such a way that he allows their errors and mistakes to help them progress in good, because they increase in humility and knowledge" (de corr. et gr. 24) (Similarly Thomas S. Th. I, 2. 79, 4 I, 2. 87, 2 ad 2.) "And didn't the Savior himself once say that whoever is forgiven more also loves more" (Pf. p. 560, 3, see Dan. p. 23). So this idea of "blessing of sin" is not entirely Nordic.

Of course, we must fear sin and the just God, who is not "a God of the present" in the sense that "he no longer calculates in the past" (R. p. 237). However, not with an "account book" and "arithmetic pen", not even in a past that is his, i.e. i. God's would be; because God is temporal. That's why our past is never hidden from his ignorance. According to Edart, there are two reasons why people have reason to fear the Lord: firstly, because he is all-knowing, so that no guilt can remain hidden from him, secondly, because he is the all-righteous, so that nothing remains without his punishment" (Karrer p. 108).

A resurrection from all sin is always possible for a human being if he actively encounters divine mercy (Pf. pp. 216, 24). "Repentance", "confession" and "satisfaction" are the Christian means of salvation to which Eckart refers (Karrer p. 101).

Is Edart's assessment of sin and remorse really so different from the common Catholic one? Does he think here even a hair differently than the torn, unfree, bastardized Augustine?" (R. p. 236). Who, by the way, takes revenge for these strange predicates in the immediately following sentence. In contrast to Augustine, R. wants to prove "the enduring divine vitality" of "the Nordic man", "the elevation of his soul to ever higher light" (R. 236) by the fact that this person even presents himself as an image of the holy ones Trinity. Despite the inconsistency that lies in this for R. Edart, for whom God is only a self-created idea, it doesn't help at all: For the man who has this very "Nordic" idea, according to which our memory Godbater, our understanding God John, who assigned our will in an image to the Holy Spirit, formulated it for the first time and gave it to the entire medieval speculation, is precisely the "African" Augustine. This thought always recurs in his writings, as well as in those of St. Thomas again.

In this image of our soul with God, which is thereby distinguished above all creatures, this is precisely where our true worship of God lies. And

As we have already said: her true freedom lies in obedience to God, who created her for herself. He doesn't just give it meaning and purpose (see above!), he is the reason for our freedom, because he supports it, because he is the one who makes self-determination possible for people in the first place. Because without God's creative power, man would be nothing; our ultimate causality (self-determination) is wonderfully modeled on his all-causality.

That's why there are degrees in our freedom, insofar as the negative, freedom, where we are free from all guilt", where we are "freer because we are not attached to things", rises to the highest positive freedom. There the soul is "freest of all (breest of all): because it is free from everything, even from itself, and enclosed in the abysses of its origin." There "God has poured his grace into the soul, which is so in love destroyed" (Pf. p. 393, 23 ff.).

So we see: the highest nobility, the highest freedom, the highest honor, the highest grace, the highest love, the highest being, the highest no-longer-being, in the mystical unity of grace of God and soul all these superlatives intertwine.

Everything is one, and one is everything. God, the simplicity without end, he entered into our Geete, the "simplicity in itself" simplifies everything. Then I really found everything in the one and I have overcome everything. The soul of the mystifier and that of all Christian believers already finds out about this complete unio (unity) of the afterlife here, especially in communion (in the union), "in a boursmade of eternal life" (Pf. 380, 21): namely "in the blessed presence of God in the holy sacrament" (Pf. ibid. p.31). It seems

to us that scholarly research has made a difference here in particular miss an important moment. For the inexhaustible source of mystical life bubbles up in the holy union of people with the Eucharistic Christ. As today as then and always. Whoever is my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him" (John 6:57), "not I live, Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20), the mystical love goes on and on - and life stream through the church of the millennia and strips what we today call mysticism of its historical specificity. About the teaching of the Lord's

Supper that worships material", from "Mit-
[dragging old shackles" and the like. says R. (p. 129). How could he also know about the great and immeasurable perfection and the wonderful joy that diu sele has bon of the blessed presence of God in the Holy Sacrament" (Pf. pp. 380, 30). For we han da got in gote and us in gote" (ibid. 6). Let us hear in the following a passage where all the festive magic of the Corpus Christi festival that has just been celebrated (by Juliana of Liège), the restrained glow of Thomistic hymns, this whole new one Wave of Eucharistic enthusiasm sparkles in the content of these crystalline words. Yes, so etivas of the smoky value of our Ultars, of the golden shine of our Biboria, of the morning light and sacrificial earlyness, of all the lovely majesty of this mystery resonates in the extremely heartfelt words of our Master, fvo he then immerses everything human, cosmic and divine at the same time in the abundance of the Eucharistic miracle. One must also have an ear for the delicate melodies and the charming naivety of our Middle High German mother tongue,

to experience the highest level of verbal art here. So it is said: a special value that lies in our Lord's Corpus Christi is a burning of divine love. It is God alone who is responsible for all things. He loves himself with the same love for his own sake. What the human soul does is that it is inflamed with divine love, it loves God for God's sake, in God's way, and now loves all things from God in integrity. God is truly love, and love is truly God. He who dwells in him with love truly dwells in God and God in him. Not just as a containment of his essence, just as God contains all creatures in his essence. There is much more at stake here: God lives in the soul as a friend with his friend. A friend who reveals all his hidden secrets to his dear friend. It also reveals God in sweetness to his dear friend: He has nothing hidden in his being, but he reveals it to the soul that is ready for the influence of his grace. Whoever receives just one eyeshot, the soul pays no attention to them or to anything that is not God. Friend likes to be with dear friends, God alone is a constant friend. God loves us with eternal love and wants to stay with us always until the end. So the Holy Sacrament is a great joy to all good people. Blessed is the person who often receives our Lord's Corpus Christi with a pure heart and with firm faith. Man is strengthened in all holiness and perfection by the power of the Holy One. Corpus Christi of our Lord" (Pf. p. 377, 34 ff.).

In his defense, the master speaks of the "bread of bread that is changed on the various altars into the one and only body of the Lord himself, which was conceived and born of Mary the Virgin, who suffered under Pontius Pilate. Even the isolated forms may remain behind, our spirit will be accepted in grace, and we will be united to the true Son of God, we will become members of the only Head of the Church, which is Christ" (Dan. 15, cf. p. 31; 54 etc.).

This is Master Eckart! And here he is ours. Who could doubt that? Can one really attribute a "religion of blood" to this man? If everything Eckart has had to say to us so far is not supposed to be a lie, then such a claim is a complete nonsense. Anyone who still has any sense of a holistic or For someone who has a grasp of the shape of intellectual history, something like this is completely impossible.

Nevertheless, R. believes that he has saved the least and strongest trump card for his opinion until now. It is the conditioned part of a conditional sentence that appeals to him, which he highlights through sperrorud and ignores all its conditionality, all context of meaning, being happy about such a discovery. You can almost feel R.'s joy of discovery, which quickly renounces the antithetical character of this passage, just for that To caress the little seat that contains so much Gobineau and Chamberlain at once. Now, it is of course more than strange that Master Eckart, with all his considerable German-Latin literature, literally squanders this fundamental teaching of his in just one half of a conditional saga", so that the searching spade of a lucky finder only comes to light completely by chance a full six hundred years later hits here. And what does the "smart" master have? a wealth of Old and New Testament explanations, from scholastic

speculative scholarly stuff to hide half of his little seat with the precious treasure here, and then never explicitly return to his new religion again, not even in a quarter of a little seat. We have to say this: This Eckart is the strangest religious founder who ever lived, and Boniface was certainly superior to him in his courage to confess.

Let's finally move on to this precious Sazjuivel itself. Edart actually says: "The most noble thing in a human being is blood...", but not without further ado, but only under a condition that is actually even more difficult to understand would have to be considered the conditioned, namely only if it" d. i. the blood, good wills." More than that! This entire conditional sentence is only one part of a non-thesis, the second of which I could absolute and block with the same right as the first. Now the matter looks different, namely: "The most forgotten thing in a human being is also blood," but only under one condition, when it wants to do evil." (cf. R. S. 257/58 and Pf. S. 179, 15 ff.).

So these contradictory properties of our blood are not beyond good and evil, but both "nobleness" and its opposite are dependent on corresponding moral qualities. The latter are at least the standard above all blood.

But let us not fall into R.'s error, but rather consider the passage in its context, because he is the only one able to shed light on it. The passage is in a sermon that prefaces Mark X, 28: "Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul." It goes on to say: "For the spirit does not kill the spirit, the spirit gives life to the spirit. What will kill you is blood (!) and flesh! They die together. The most noble thing in man is blood, if it wants good. But the most noble thing in man is , that is blood when it wants to do evil. If the blood prevails over the flesh, then the person is humble, patient, feisty and has all the virtues. But if the flesh prevails over the blood, then the person becomes proud, angry, and unfeeling and has every vice in itself. (Note the exactly antithetical construction of this sentence compared to the previous one!) Here St. John is praised, whom God himself praised. That's the passage.

R. does not bring it, nor the immediate front seat of his petition, which reads: "Flesh and blood, that die together." It must be noted here that Master Edart was with this very blood, whose mythical religion he supposedly proclaimed (R. p. 258), which brought the hard word into context, which reads: "The sons of the flesh, whose work and conduct are forged after the blood, whose life comes from sin, will be either here or there (in the hereafter!) of "Win the middle of the day" (Pf. p. 369, 27). There it is said: What is born of the flesh is flesh; But whatever is born of the Spirit is Spirit. The flesh is coarse, the spirit noble, their natures are unequal and opposed to each other" (Pf. pp. 369, 33). And this opposition of flesh and blood on the one hand and the spirit on the other is shown to be the result of Original sin.

If the above passage is to have any meaning at all and not fall completely out of Edart's system, then the superlative: "The noblest" is to be understood relatively here, namely as the noblest of two: flesh and blood. Presumably

This is based on a physiological theory from the Middle Ages, according to which blood takes precedence over flesh in the order and life structure of our body-soul unity. So it was said above, "The flesh is coarse, the spirit is noble," so that the blood may rank between the two. And this blood submits to the spirit, and on the other hand prevails over the inferior flesh, thus maintaining proper order, so it also has the "nobilius esse", the nobler being, has the most share in the good, at least more than the flesh and all subordinate powers. Because the old axiom: *quidquid recipitur secundum modum recipientis recipitur* also applies to Master Eckart. The connoisseur may be pleased to hear the master's Middle High German oversight: "An ieglich enpfölich dinc will receive and bazzet in sime enpfahende according to the wise of the enpfahende." (Every thing to be received is received according to the manner and nature of the recipient.) This Spiritualization of the physical is an early Christian matter. Don't we already read in St. Paul about the "waiting of creation for the revelation of the children of God", yes, that "creation itself will be freed from the bondage of transience to the freedom of glory of the children of God" (Rom. 8:19-22). We "as the firstfruits of the Spirit" even know about the "redemption of our bodies, not only in hope" but in the confusion of the eternal vision.

If the blood has lived up to Eckart's condition (if it wants well!), then it is the noblest carrier of life in the hierarchy of blood vital forces.

But... (and this antithesis is on an equal footing, so that... you can't overlook it!) that same blood is immediately that "worst" when it stands in rebellion against the spirit, and on the other hand when Flesh in inversion and disorder rebels against the blood, the flesh the blood prevails. Because the essence of all sin is the abolition of the spiritual ordered balancing of tensions within the vital-spiritual hierarchy. According to Eckart and all scholasticism, sin is perbension, disorder in the vital and spiritual realm, because one is organically integrated into the other. This is how Master Eckart wants to be understood; because only then will all his come. They come into their own and don't need to go through Procrustean cures with sperrorud and shamefully secretive elisions before they willingly allow themselves to be abused for Gobineau and Chamberlain.

But basically it is the radical stylistic contrast between Christian thinking and the mechanistic-evolutionistic thinking of modernity in general that breaks out here. The latter would also like to claim our master Eckart for itself.

In contrast, the irrefutable principle that Thomas (De ver. XXVI. 5. 2) formulates as follows applies to all Adventist and Christian thinking: "*quanto aliquid perfectius tanto principalius est.*" i.e. more perfect thing, the more it is the beginning and cause of the world as a whole. It's just one thing. Another version of the basic saying: *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, nothing comes from nothing, applied to the social order of space. From the mechanical area. The biotic region does not come from the purely biotic, nor the spiritual region of being arise. Nothing can happen, what is below can never be what is above, what is give birth, but always the other way around. The excess of meaning and being of each. A higher level of form also requires its own because it is not contained in the lower level.

Explanation. Mechanism and Darwinism are against this basic law of all metaphysics are allowed to sin for 200 years. Only today there seems to be a change to initiate genuine organic thinking. But whoever takes the spirit out of that

Blood deduces, the higher from the lower, is still that succumb to nihilistic pantheism and thinks anything but organically. Everyone You have to leave it to its own right, it can never interpret its meaning to experience from the lower, to "evolve" from it, unless that Higher ones are preformed by a higher one in the lower ones. May vary in time the higher from the lower, as the concepts from the An-observations, according to nature it always has to precede it.

And just as the late development of a genuinely conceptual thinking from the finnish-intuitive imagination is only possible under the pre-establishment of a spiritual principle, so in nature the "biogenetic" development of the spiritual realm of being from the vital is only possible under the pre-establishment of Establishment of an aligning and all-normative primary cause from which the "exitus creaturarum in esse" (De ver. XXIII. 4 ad 6) could only take place.

As I said: This is the fundamental stylistic contrast between Christian thought and that of modernity. And all those who make blood their god draw one of the possible consequences from this attitude of thinking, just as others (Feuerbach-Marx) brought up from that "below" not the "organic" but the "inorganic" basic material in order to get it to make them their "god". Beyond "substance- — worshipping," to use R.'s word, some remained the same as others. Others made ratio, reason, the highest, and still others believed, with Hegel, that everything is in constant change, becoming an absolute idea.

But they are all simply evolutionary nihilists, those who don't pray for anything, to which they are inevitably relegated when they turn their backs on being itself, the ipsum esse: the idealistic pantheists, the rationalists, the materialists and Marxists, the Darwinists, the sanguinists. They all want to come from pure darkness to light, while we know, bass, vice versa, the light shines into the darkness. Some want to explain twilight from pure night, we, on the other hand, from the sun and night. With this natural understanding of ours, we have always been alone in this world. It's good that we keep saying that to each other today. And isn't it extremely characteristic that our natural knowledge was only able to maintain itself in the shadow of the supernatural, and that the philosophy of common sense could always only assert itself in alliance with Christian theology. Is it perhaps an "organic" necessity with which true philosophy demands true theology and vice versa? "Philosophia ancilla theologiae"... doesn't the history of basic reason prove this to us? More than one person is committed to this abstinence from the "God in the highest", this truly analogous behavior.

For him God is being, unity, truth, goodness, freedom, love, eternity, who not only has all these characteristics but is essential to him. This is only possible through its communication to the creature, because it is nothing of itself, but everything from him. It is nothing from below, from the subject, from those who work in the subconscious, but rather "a kind of counterpart of the soul" (R. p. 257).

No, the soul has no kind of equal counterpart, not even the body, in such a way that it could even be caused by it. Because "diu sele is a forme des libes" (Pf. p. 481, 20), which makes the body with blood and flesh possible in the first place in terms of meaning and in accordance with its being, since it gives life to the libé bas" (Pf. p. 409, 24).

Just as the soul gives life downwards, it also receives it from above. So we do not receive all being, all goodness, all justice, all life from the subject, but the subject receives from them, through them and in them (as eternal units of meaning!) being just, being true, being good and things of this kind, since they are earlier than their subjects and remain even when their subjects have passed away, as Augustine teaches" (Dan. p. 27). Namely, they remain in God, who essentially is all these things.

So all our being, all our divinity, honor and freedom never come from us, we are never and never equal to God, because all the being of creatures depends on the presence of God" (Dan. p. 56).

This is the unshakable, traditional fundamental teaching of Master Eckart. Without it he remains completely incomprehensible in everything, all his sentences incoherent. From this Christian "sursum corda" of his mind and heart, he preached the words of St. John, which we put here on purpose: "So St. John also says in his Gospel that all received power and can become sons of God not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of man's desire, but of God and of God alone" (Bf. 420, 20).

"So the soul can speak when it lifts itself up to God: I go zu Got from whom I came" (Pf. p. 410, 9).

Fourth section

Eckart's relationship to the church

In the following, Eckart's relationship to the church remains to be briefly examined.

For him the church is a living body into which we are all lovingly placed. The soul of this mysterious body is Christ. It is the Pauline doctrine of *bonum corpus Christi mysticum*, *bonum mystical body of Christ*, to which the mystic Eckart is completely devoted. "We are members under one Head of the church, which is Christ" (Dan. 15). In this equality we are all one son (Pf. p. 288, 5). And "what the individual members do is The actions of the wearer, and what the wearer does, belongs to the whole, not just to the Geele and not just to the body, let alone the individual member or a single force. From this it follows in our case that all work and all suffering of every believer is a — member Christ and God is common to all believers who are members. This is the community of saints" (Karter p. 126). And for these

Church he preaches the socialism of love in inspiring words (see Karrer p. 128).

How was it possible that 28 of Eckart's theses could be condemned by this very church? The reasons are external.

Master Eckart was a Dominican and therefore belonged to the order that at that time enjoyed the highest fame in its saints: Mbertus Magnus and Thomas Aquino. Master Eckart was one of their greatest sons and conveyed their intellectual heritage widely as a university teacher in Paris and as a preacher in all regions of Germany with great intellectual power and igniting power of language.

In contrast, friction with the other large orders, namely the Franciscans, was inevitable. Proof of the liveliness and existentiality of the medieval spirit! And yet, the unity of faith embraced all these disputing and diverging spiritual forces and arched them up to the magnificent zectonics of their sums that we stand in amazement before today.

Master Eckart was also drawn into these learned disputes between the Franciscans and the Dominicans. The dispute was sometimes fought with the harsh means of a fresh era that was great in prayer and thinking, but also great in struggle and human passion. The blame is always shared between both sides, as is the case in our case.

In any case, the Archbishop of Cologne, Hein-

Rich von Virneburg, and brought a lawsuit against Master Eckart matters of faith. The success was that Master Eckart conditioned in 1327

Retraction: If etivas erroneous things are found in his teaching
If he should, he should revoke this beforehand; a deviation in belief
However, he was aware of a few points.

The dispute spreads all the way to the Pope. John XXII intervened and had the documents from the episcopal court sent in. After careful examination by the Pope himself and various cardinals, he condemned 28 of Edart's theses on March 27, 1329. But Master Eckart himself had died two years earlier.

When R. speaks without a trace of historical reference "about extra help with a little powder" (p. 254), this may shed light on the degree of objectivity with which he is used to seeing these things.

We are now in the fortunate position of possessing the master's Latin justification, which he submitted to the Cologne Commission on September 26, 1326. It was published by the Benedictine Father Daniels in 1923 after it had already been found 30 years earlier in the Soest city library.

It almost seems like a coincidence that Master Eckart was forced in this way to take a stand on the most controversial of his theses. Because without this defense of his, interpreting the master in some things would be much more difficult. One thing is certain: Anyone who has not read this master's defense without prejudice cannot afford to judge the entire inconvenience. Because what Eckart knows is a question of history, not of ideological intuition or propaganda," says Karrer rightly in his book, Meister Eckart, Munich 1923, which is still indispensable today.

There have been many controversies surrounding Master Edart over the years. Especially since around 1900 a previously unexplored interest in German mysticism suddenly began, especially on the non-Catholic side. However, since Denifle's sharp Uttade, men like Karrer and Dempf have achieved something crucial for a holistic interpretation of Edart, who, after all, what R. seems to have missed, are among the Catholic writers (cf. R. p. 221 note).

But today we can say that Master Edart lived tragically, i.e. i. has fallen into "innocent guilt".

He himself knows how complicated and difficult his high speculations are. His sermons place considerable demands on his listeners and are unthinkable without an audience that is somehow theologically trained. In fact, the beguines and nuns to whom he often preached, even though their pastoral care was entrusted to his order, also had a certain level of theological education. In the Middle Ages, beguines were the name given to unmarried women who, although secular, led a religious-like life in certain houses, the beguinages. They still exist today in Belgium and Holland. At that time they were widespread; there were 140 beguinages in Cologne alone. The Begharden are the male counterpart to these lay sisters. It was left to R. to summarily make them heretics and to attribute to Meister Eckart some kind of secret dealings with them outside the church.

Even though Edart may have preached in these circles with their certain theological training, the danger of misunderstandings and distortions of his ideas was all the less ruled out since the master repeatedly used the device of paradox. A thought is greatly exaggerated and given a twist that has never been heard before. Then he sounds isolated and disjointed. Very unhappy, "male sonata", as Master Eckart himself says (Dan. 15.9).

The master's intention behind all this was undoubtedly good. Because it was important to him to show the entire greatness and majesty of the Christian - to convey to his readers and listeners the teachings of the Middle Ages, their universalism, their heaven-storming summit, their wondrous architecture. In St. Thomas, medieval thinking had powerfully penetrated both divine and world wisdom and combined them into one. The special feature of Edartian mysticism now lay in this that those tactile truths of Thomism called up in him all the powers of the mind in order to make their glories truly palpable. And this sparkling impact of Thomistic spirituality on his receptive soul brings about an unmeasured joy of God-begging, which is only increased by the liturgical-sacramental reality. While Thomas' thinking rose carefully from the world to God, Master Edart, conversely, opened up the world from above, from God. And in the jubilant exuberance of his God-unified soul, who now has one in everything and everything in one, the boundaries of things and thoughts flow into one another. His greatest happiness, apart from the desolate vision of the things of God, is to give to the people entrusted to him what his heart is more than happy about. He doesn't want to convey to them the simple truth, but the "veritas pulchra" the "beautiful truth" which at the same time "moralizes and humbly and ardently draws one to the love of God" ad amorem dei inflammans. Dan. 36; cf. also *ibid.* Beile 53).

This idea always returns to an igniting (excitantis, Dan. 44, 15), we would say modernly: an "existential" theology, which forces him to make use of heightened word and conceptual effects (*locutio emphatica*, (Dan. p. 39), having experienced Thomistic classicism — anyone else — like hardly

The truth should be transformed into the good, that is its constant gorge. The perfect person is not the one who has the truth, but rather the one who lives it. "One master of reading (in this sense!) is dearer to him than a thousand masters of reading" (Pf. G. 589, 19).

Like the master in this way, beyond all mere intellectualism wants to see how he himself gets lost in the pressing fullness of his speculation, that wants to be conveyed to others through him, it seems understandable if For him the simple word form, the calmed, subdued period breaks apart. And then, in this ecstasy of his mystical temperament, he goes overboard sharp and flashy turns of phrase, just to capture what is possible in terms of perceived content. So his sermons bubble up with sentences that have to be objected to because of the dynamic nature of the hour. Edart himself explains several times that their sound is "false" (*falsum est ut sonat*, Dan. 37, 7).

But all of his explosive speech is only intended to stir up people's minds, never to deviate in matters of faith. He indignantly rejects such things back, "since I always confess my faith publicly," „*fidem*.

quam semper protestor: — *reprobo and detestor, qui errors vel errors mini imputari... non possunt* (Dan. 12).

But Eckart himself knew only too well that there were many ignorant people and even zealots (*emuli*) among his listeners who, in their own way, accepted his thoughts and thus slipped away from the truth. But could he, was he allowed to count and weigh everything that burned within him, with all the changing lights in which the high interior of the Eternal shone before him? Who can decide?

And the church? Who, like them, has carried the divine truth-shak untouched through the turmoil of the millennia? Who is surprised if, worried about this treasure, she approaches all exaggeration and everything new with sensitive consideration? Mustn't she, who is serious and pensive, with eternity at her head, come down from the high past, the times in which she encountered the fates of individuals and nations, some vain human greatness without number, in order to *an* perish like chaff and desert sand?

What can you who have your head in the inaccessible light through the heaven and earth reaches down to the gates of hell, what can you do? be the individual who carries the burden of millennia and the secrets of the future? The *bonum commune*, the sanctification of the peoples and of all humanity, which lies in severe woe, is now its task with all the terribleness that the blood of the only begotten demanded of its father . . .

Master Edart's tragedy needs to be seen in this perspective. Only here do all petty criticisms and resentments disappear. The church has condemned the individual who was of good will. Her saying was never aimed at the erring one, always at the error. And in our case it is by no means the whole thing

Edart, but from his entire extensive literature there are 28 sentences that the church has made. Because isolated and removed from context, they can become destructive to all too many in this world of danger where Satan sows weeds.

It is not only the Church's right to speak here, but also its grave duty. And the tragedy is just as heavy for them, who have to condemn without choice, as for the one who is hit by their sentence. And whether it entails temporal or eternal death, the ultimate is the matter of the inscrutable, which is justice itself.

In the Eckart case, the church expressly recognized the master's bona fides in its verdict. And Master Eckart himself probably interpreted his tragedy deeply with all the humility but also the sacrificial strength of the Christ disciple. "Everything that is wrong in my writings and words without my special knowledge, I am always ready to give way to the better meaning. Because we little spirits cannot bear such huge masses of thoughts and, as Hieronimus once said, we succumb to the risk of something that is beyond our strength. For I can err, yes, but I can never be a heretic, no, because the first concerns the intellect, but the second concerns the will" (Dan. 2).

This is the deep meaning that the master himself wrested from all the details of his fate. That is why we must refuse to interpret this fate as a catastrophe for the Master. He didn't feel that way himself, especially since he knew that even St. Thomas and also St. Bertus Magnus was suspected of certain errors for a long time (cf. Dan. 1). One must always remember that in the Middle Ages these great things were not fought with the pathos of modern hostility to the church, but with the believing ethos of people who fought for the difficult task of the "summus pontifex" and the "romana curia" (Dan. 2) knew: namely, to carry the divine host of truth through the ages.

People knew how to defend themselves and fight in these high days of the human spirit, but they also knew how to faithfully and humbly submit to God-ordained authority. Always out of the belief that we are not equal to God in freedom and honor, but that we are pure nothing compared to Him (unum purum nihil; Dan. 34), that we are poor and naked to the core (Dan. 36 , 25).

If the church at that time rejected 28 sentences from Edart's literature as dangerous, history proves how right it was. Because time and time again, error has attacked Edart, both now and then, in order to misinterpret his lofty words.

But we believe that we have shown how Eckart stands far above all of this, because he is one of the most delicate blossoms on the widely shady tree of the universal church and one of the most intelligent and purest personalities of German Catholicity. And as Christians we know that the tragic sacrifice that he, the individual, had to make, as well as it had to be demanded of the community of the church, flamed heavenwards into the foretaste of which Master Eckart has all too often felt down here, and from that He, like no one else, knew that he had unspeakable things for those who loved him.

Remarks

3u I. First section

1. It-Kutjcha, archaeological and religious-historical research on Zempere paintings from Buddhist caves from the first centuries after the birth of Christ, Berlin 1920.

2. For the last overview of the state of Etruscan research, see B. Nogara, *Gli Etruschi e la loro civiltà*, Milan 1933.

3. Gustav Herbig, *The secret language of the Disciplina Etrusca*, publication reports of the Bahrian Academy of Sciences, Philos.-philol. and historical class 1923, 1st paper pp. 1-25.

4. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XXVII, 1924, Col.

179 f. Today more than ever we are convinced of the influence of race on the shape of a people and its life and works. If you want to feel the Etruscan spirit, go to Florence! There could hardly be a city in Italy with a more pronounced character, and even if here, as elsewhere, it is difficult to attribute the individual events and the created works to the various racial, psychological, general cultural, even accidental influences, yes, it is permissible. One can also see in the characteristics of Florence something of the characteristics of the Etruscan race. But where has ever lived a stronger, more peculiar, more hardy people than in this city, which with its 50,000 inhabitants can offer support to emperors and popes, at the same time trades across the entire known earth, has down-to-earth craftsmanship, cheerful in fraternal conflicts torn apart, so that the houses of the old, proud families within the city are to this day truss buildings and "fortresses", and yet the intellectual energy and the "leisure" find their way to cultural creations of the most unheard of kind. And anyone who still experiences today, how proud the Florentines (with more or less injustice) feel they are Etruscans, and therefore superior to the Romans, and to whom the Etruscan spirit was then revealed in Florence, R.'s theories about the "subhumanity" of this proud, over-found race fall flat collapsed, even before he had established through scientific work that R., as explained above, had fallen victim to

a deception. 4a Just as R. relied too trustingly on false sources regarding the Etruscan root of the papacy, just as well if he gave etivas to the papacy "Jewish." I don't know whether he was thinking about the alleged Jewish plans for world domination, which, according to the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," representatives of Judaism are said to have hatched and advised. R. himself published and edited these "Protocols": *The Protocols of the Sages of Bion and Jewish World Politics*. The first edition appeared in Mün- then 1923; on March 1933, the 20th thousand was published, completely re-edited by A. Bhilipp. I would like to go into the history of this much-negotiated bread roll fart. In 1864, a small volume of 337 pages was published in Brussels: *Dialogue aux enfers between Machiavel and Montesquieu or the politics of Machiavel in the XIXth century, for a contemporary period*. The unnamed "contributor", the author, later became known. It was Maurice Joly, an opponent of Napoleon III's domestic policy, who was elected president for four years by popular vote on December 10, 1848, then after the coup of On December 2nd, 1851, he was elected president for 10 years with almost unlimited power, and finally the referendum on December 2nd, 1852, the Kaiser had been elected. In the extremely witty book, Maurice Joly fakes a long conversation in 24 dialogues, which takes place in the corridors of the underworld during a break in refraction - takes place between the shadow of the Florentine statesman Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), who became known as the theorist of princely, unscrupulous absolutism through his *"Libro del Principe"* (1516), and Ch. de Montesquieu (1689-1755), became the representative of the modern constitutional state through his work *"De l'esprit des lois"* (1748). The content of the long conversation is, with regard to Napoleon's quarrel, to always build up his absolute rule with the means of democracy, whether and like a man in the 19th century

deprive a people of their freedom while maintaining democratic forms blow dry. It deals with the various liberal constitutions in the European states at the time, moves on to the question of whether it was possible to get all the *Getvalt* into the hands of one man through a coup, and then deals with the increasingly astonished Machiavel in a whole series of dialogues and from dialogue to dialogue, to make clear to the more defeated Montesquieu how the abolition of freedom in the 19th century was feasible, with regard to the Bresse, the judiciary, the universities, the finance system, the popular mood, the possible religious opposition, etc. Only to the end The author Montesquieu notices that his counterpart is talking about France in all this. In the words of the completely broken Montesquieu: *Dieu éternel, qu'avez-vous permis!* The last dialogue concludes dramatically, and the shadows have to return to their barking. Napoleon understood satire well, which is why he had the book published where he could get hold of it, and ultimately also identified and imprisoned the author. Therefore the book is very rarely ordered; a shame, because it is extremely funny and excitingly written and well deserves a German review. This book was used by Russian opponents of the Jews. They made large excerpts, apparently in a rather hasty manner, as the oversight errors indicate, distributed the conversation between Machiavel and Montesquieu among Jewish magnates who were said to have held a congress whose object was the subjugation of Christians to an international Jewish rule, and left the whole, jo fabricated mystification i. 3. 1905 of the 3rd edition of a Russian Adventist book *beidruden*, the first edition of which was published in Moscow in 1901 under the title: "The great in the small, or the approaching Untichrist is close" by a certain Sergei Nilus. The first edition with the The appendix was only published in a very small edition; apparently it was intended to be played into the hands of the bear in order to take him against the Jews. New Russian editions with the attached protocols appeared in 1911, 1912 and 1917, finally in Berlin in 1920. The forgery is true clumsy to say the least; but it was probably her unimaginable boldness that amazed a number of men, first Gottfried zur Beeff in 1919, who spoke her in German in Berlin, and then a French priest, Msgr. Iouin, who spoke her in French in 1920 A translation was published, which was followed by another French translation by R. Lambelin in 1921. A translation appeared in Umerika without an author's name in 1920, which was immediately followed by a longer edition in London in the same year and a new translation in 1924. Henry Ford, the famous automobile king, had a longer version published in America; his book was immediately translated into German in 1922. Then, in addition to a Polish translation from 1923, there followed the German adaptation of R. 1923 mentioned above and one by Th. Fritsch, the owner of the anti-Semitic Hammerberlag, in 1924, both of which have appeared in many editions since then. Finally, I only mention this with the deepest embarrassment it, a German adaptation by a Catholic Austrian clergyman, Gaston Ritter, under the title: *Judaism and the shadows of the Untichrist*, 1933. In the meantime, a book by B. Segel, "The Protokolle of the Wise Men of Bion, has been thoroughly illuminated". Berlin 1924, the situation was clarified with absolutely compelling evidence and the value of Maurice Joly was pointed out. R., who apparently did not see Joly's book, which is also rare in the *Zat*, evaded the evidence by saying that Joly is the same as Joel, the *Verjasser* is therefore a Jew, probably without considering that even in the event that Joly was a Jew, which should be ruled out according to the entire *Zenor* of his book, so that the evidence is not shaken that the stated - legal vermin protocols from 1905 (already in 1864 in Brussels as *Bud*) against Napoleon III. have been drudged. Gaston Ritter, who of course never saw the 1864 book, writes this attempt. to stick to the authenticity, just R. after. Th. Fritsch helps himself by saying that he cannot imagine that an Aryan mind would be able to think up such a system of mischievous villainy and such shameless consistency" (edition from 1933, p. 73); but that is the case a satirical-polemical one Writing against Napoleon III. That the Russians, who published the protocols in 1905

According to the French *Dialogue aux Enfers*, the fact that Jews have nothing to do with their creation is simply obvious to anyone who has the opportunity to place the *Dialogue aux Enfers* next to the protocols. So if people clung to the authenticity of the protocols even after Segel's book was published, this can only be explained by the fact that the advocates of authenticity lacked the opportunity to see the French book and that they did not want to believe Segel, which presents the *Dialogue* and the *Protokolle* side by side. In any case, the protocols should disappear from the discussion and their content should therefore no longer be used even indirectly. 5.

For the sermon see G. Morin, *Texts inédits relatifs au Symbols et à la vie chrétienne*, *Revue bénédictine* XXII, 1905, 518; see G. Schnürer, *Church and Culture in the Middle Ages II* (1929), p. 62. About the survival of the Herenbelief see N. Baulus, *Herenwahn and witch trials, especially in the 16th century*, 1910.

It is the big mistake in Soldan-Heppe, *History of the Witch Trials* (re-edited and edited by May Bauer), 2 vols., Munich 1911, that they mislead the reader about the roots of witchcraft. The explanations and resolutions against the Herenbelief that we have cited above are also reproduced in Soldan-Heppe (p. 109 ff.). But since the authors do not proceed chronologically, the reader will confuse phenomena from later times, in which church circles were involved in the hereditary faith, with those from earlier times, in which church circles were still uninvolved. By the way, there was also belief in witches outside the Germanic world, about Soldan-Heppe, chap. 2-6, act, is known; but it is not the root of Germanic.

5a *Commentary on the New Testament*, edited by Th. Bahn I, *Das Evangelium of Matthew 3* 1910, p. 544, note 65.

6. Cf. Eusebius, *Church History*, VIII, 24 and Lactantius, *On the Types of Death* c. 13; as literature, for example A. Ehrhard, *The Church of the Martyrs, their tasks and their achievements*, München 1932, p. 88, and H. Achelis, *Christianity in the first three centuries*, Munich 1912, II, p. 298 f. See

7. *The Lausiac History of Palladius* ed C. Butler, Cambridge 1904, p. 48.

8. "The *Pfaffenspiegel*", of which, according to information in the edition I used, Volume 1 of the *Freidenfer* books, no fewer than 1,250,000 (!) *Gremplars* were distributed, has a special chapter in which the saints are ridiculed. There it is claimed, of course without citing the source, that the nuns of St. Therese drank out of drinking bowls, put dead mice and other disgusting things in their mouths, drank blood, dipped their bread in rotten cheese and took the bun with them needles had pierced". In a corresponding manner, Macarius and Hilarion, Eusebius (i.e. others than Hilarius and Eufabius) and even St. Francis of Assisi.

3 u I. 3 further section

1. Compare, for example, the article *Scotus* by S. M. Deutsch in the *Realenchflopädie f. protest. Theology and Church* XVIII, 86 ff., dated. p. 89.

2. See *ibid.* Art. *Baco*, by Bödler. II, 344 f.

3rd edition by Wattenbach in: *Jaffé, Bibl. rer. Germ.* VI, 39 ff.; German translation of Wattenbach in: *Historians of prehistoric German times*, 1888. 4 *Légendes hagiographiques*, Brussels 1905. German by E. A. Stückerberg, Kempten-Munich 1907.

5. G. Schnürer and 3. Riz, *Sanft Kümmeris and Volto Santo Studies and Pictures* (Research 3. *Folklore*, edited by G. Schreiber, issue 13-15), Düsseldorf 1934.

6. *Thegans Vita Ludwigs* see *Mon. Germ. SS.* II, 585 ss.; German translation by Jasmund Wattenbach. *Historian of prehistoric German times* 1889.

7. Becher, *Germanic Heroism and the Christian Spirit* (1934) shows that the literary life of the Germanic peoples was disrupted by the teaching of Christianity.

8. About Beguines and Begarden see I. Greben, *The beginnings of the Beguines*, Münster 1912, and Art. Beguines and Begarden by H. Haupt in *d. Real-encyclopedia f. protest. Theol. and Church II*, 516 ff.
9. The question raised in the last section about the instruction of the Germanic peoples has been brought into the full light of historical research and, like rarely, a question raised has been illuminated. Above all, it must be emphasized that Protestant scholars have done excellent educational work here in recent months. We are grateful to them for this brotherly service! Dörries wrote the best, *Germanic Religion and Instruction of the Teutons*, Göttingen 1934 (you should definitely read this little book!); Also good are Baetle, *Art-own Germanic Religion and Christianity*, Berlin-Leipzig 1934; Rüdert, *The Christianization of the Germanic Peoples*, Zübingen 1933; from Walter's *Ausjåße in Künmeth-Schreiner*, *Nation before God*, Berlin 1934; also Baetle, *Art and Faith of the Teutons*, Hamburg 1934.
10. H. Ch. Lea, *A History of Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, New York 1888: I quote from the German edition by I. Hansen, 1905-13, 1, 6.117. A good history of the Inquisition, distinguished by its objectivity, is E. Vacandard, *L'Inquisition*. Paris 1912.
11. For more on the question of the baht of the Inquisition victims, see Vacandard p. 237 f.
12. On the Emmeram question, see Br. Krusch in the introduction to his edition of the *Vita in den Mon. Germ. Script. rer. Mer. IV*, 452 ff., and the *Uusjaß* by the same author: My edition of the *Vita Haimhrammi before the Judgment Seat Bernhard Sepps*. New archive d. Gej. f. old. Stsh. business finds. XXIX, 335 ff.
13. The source for R. once again seems to be the *Pfaffenspiegel*. It says there in Chap. IV: "In order to more easily govern the Christian Church, Gregory ordered that Roman customs should be followed everywhere in worship and that the Latin language should be used. In most German churches, the Roman soldier Boniface had already introduced this" (blockages in the church). There is really a lot to be said about this historical nonsense of the applicant. To illustrate the spirit of the applicant, I may perhaps mention, which he previously (Chapter II) hunts down from St. Boniface: "The Frisians earned the merit of killing him along with three fifty priests, (on June 5, 759). If they had done it earlier, then perhaps we would not have known anything about the lack of shame Priests, pilgrimages, image services, relics and similar things that he made native in Germany."
14. The letter from Hadrian I is brudt *Mon. Germ. Epp. III.* 586 f. The bed. The passage reads: *Et sicut temporibus beati Silvestri Romani Pontificis a sanctae recordingis pissimo Constantino, magno imperatore, per eius largitatem sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est et potestatem in his Hesperiae partibus largiri dignatus, ita et in his vestris felicissimi s temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia, id est beati Petri apostoli, germinet atque exultet et amplius quam amplius exaltata permaneat, ut omnes gentes, quae haec audierint, edicere valeant, Domine salvum fac regem, et exaudi nos in die, in qua invocaverimus te; quia ecce novus christianissimus Dei Constantinus imperator his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctae suae ecclesiae beati apostolorum, principis Petri largiri dignatus est. Sed et cuncta alia, quae per diversos imperatores, patricios etiam et alios Deum timentes pro eorum animae mercede et venia delictorum in partibus Tusciae, Spoleto seu Benevento atque Corsica simul et Savinensae patrimonio beato Petro apostolo sanctaeque Dei et apostolicae Romanae ecclesiae concessa sunt et per nefandam gentem Langobardorum per anno-rum spatia abstulta atque ablata sunt, vestris temporibus resituantur; unde et plures donations in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensae reconditas habemus.* The Pope says very clearly that he has a large number of original finds in the archives from several emperors, patricii and other pious people, about donations to the Patrimonium of Peter, i.e. H. the real estate intended for administration and especially poor relief, in Tuscany, Spoleto, Benebent and Corsica, which were confiscated by the Lombards. It is absolutely impossible that the Pope, when he speaks of the archive, is referring to the Donation of Constantine. The context of the whole thing is important

but in my opinion it is also impossible to relate the allusion to the exaltation of the Roman Church by Constantine to the Constantinian donation.

If I understand him correctly, this is also the prudence of H. Böhmer in his art. Constantine donation in the *Reallexikon f. prot. Theol.* XI, 1 ff.

15. For the Greek text of the canon see Hefele-Leclercq. *Histoire des conciles* I. 552. There 552-69 a detailed treatment of the whole question, 556 ben Latin text, which the legate Baschasinus used in the 16th session of the Council of Chalcedon. See also E. Caspar, *History of the Bapstist I*, 1930, p. 496.

16. About the martyrdom see A. Ehrhard, *Church of the Martyrs*, p. 117 ff.

17. The best way to address the pseudo-Chrillus question is S. Merckle, Antonio Uccelli and Thomas, *Contra errores Graecorum*. *Roman Quarterly* XXXV, 1927, pp. 208-46.

18. It is particularly the achievement of U. Stuß to have shed light on the great importance of individual church worship in the religious and political life of the Germanic Christian peoples. The best way to find its summary is in the *Real Enchkl. f. prot. Theol.* XXIII, 364 ff.: "Self-church, own monastery". Further research is most fully recorded in M. Torres, *El origen del sistema de iglesias propias*, Madrid 1929.

19. Of the great literature about the Cluniacs, the work of E. Sadur, *The Cluniacs until the middle of the 11th century*, 2 vols., 1892-94, should be mentioned; as more recent 2. M. Smith, *The Early History of the Movement of Cluny*, Σέξοτό 1925. NB. I didn't go into all the details that R. provided, including the information about the anniversary year income. I. 1300 under Boniface VIII, or his Jehon Gregorovius, *Gesch. of the City of Rome* V, 1892, p. 537 f. and F. X. Kraus, *Essays* II, 1901, p. 270 corrected the error that reappeared in R. R.'s information (p. 171) can be found similarly in the *Pfaffenspiegel* chap. 3. What I did not cover in the text was not omitted because it had to be admitted to be correct, but because R. avoided citing sources and did not have the time to investigate everything down to the bottom. Wherever I have investigated one of R.'s ecclesiastical historical facts, I have found that it is either completely untenable or not : Inaccuracy in very important matters.

3 u I. Third section

1. The question of Innocence VIII's previous life and his leadership since entering the clergy examined with strict accuracy 2. Bastor, *History of the Popes since the end of the Middle Ages* III (1895), p. 174 f. Zivei illegitimate children from earlier times were not only known, but unfortunately Imocenz also promoted them as Pope. It cannot be said with certainty whether he had others from this earlier work, whose names are at least reported by fine sources. His previous life understandably weighed on his reputation; Hence a mocking epigram from Marullus with a play on words, which led to the opinion of the 8 boys and 8 girls, but which is certainly not to be taken literally and is not to be viewed as a reliable source at all.
2. The falsehood of the claim about the murder of Prince Dichem has already been shown in L'Epinois, *Le pape Alexandre VI*. *Revue des questions historiques* XXIX, 1881, p. 412.
3. Pastor a. speaks of the scandalous permission given to Lufrezia Borgia to open the letters during Mexander's absence. a. D. S. 448. The information about the actions against Gabling by Sixtus VI. permitted boy love etc. can be found in the *Pfaffenspiegel*, chap. IV, the confubinate permitted against Zara bom Pope seems to be due to misunderstanding of a passage in the *Pfaffenspiegel*, chap. V, to go back through R., where he exceptionally states his gelvährsmam, Nicholas of Clémanges, and therefore enables the verification. Nicholas of Clémanges, born around 1367, † 1437, who himself served for a long time in the service of the popes in Avignon, published a sharp reform work: *De ruina Ecclesiae* (also known under the title *De corrupto Ecclesiae statu*), which is in the large six-volume value, *Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, (it contains materials on the Council of Constance) ed. H. von der Hardt,

Helmstedt 1696 ff, brudt is available. There in c. 22, Nicholas complains that there are bishops who are so unscrupulous that they allow priests to live together with concubines for public disgrace in exchange for donations of money. R.'s source seems to have simply transferred this to the Popes. Perhaps the unnamed source used by R. also plays a role in the forgery of papal bulls discovered by Innocent3 VIII in 1489 and ever punished, about which one can read L. Pastor, History of the Popes III, 1895, p. 252 f.

4. In the edition I use of the Opera S. Alphonsi ed M. Haringer, Regensburg 1846-47, which comprises 8 volumes Octab, the section "De sexto et nono" fills 56 pages in the 3rd volume, which has 592 pages. I may probably put the first saw of the introduction of this section here: Nunc aegre materiam illam tractandam aggredimur, cuius vel nomen hominum mentes inficit. Det mihi veniam, quaeso, castus lector, si plures quaestiones et circumstantias hic discussas et declaratas inveniet. Utinam brevius aut abscurius explain me potuissem.
5. The question of the alleged sale of the Nuncio Meander has been examined in detail with precise reference to all relevant sources in N. Paulus, Bur Geschichte des Wormjer Reichstag from 1521, No. 2: A "ruthless" threat from the Nuncio Meander. Hist. Yearb. XXXIX, 1918-19, p. 273 ff.

6. For the wording of Innocence X's death, see C. Mirbt, sources for History of the Papacy and Roman Catholicism, 1911, No. 440. There is only ever explicit talk of the specific "articuli" against which the Pope objects. With a fine syllable he protests against peace as such.

7. For the history of the idea of tolerance among the reformers, see N. Paulus, Protestantism and Tolerance in the 16th Century, 1911. There also the evidence given in the Zexte.
8. Lieber Calvinism and Coligny may be permitted to quote some passages from the book by R. self-cited book by E. Mards, Gaspard von Coligny I, 1892: "This religious community feels like Judaism, it builds itself on its strong, hard history, it takes its patterns, its words and images, its names by him. A touch of the Old Testament befalls them, Coligny's comrades and Oliver Cromivell's. The austere majesty of Jehovah is communicated to Calvinism, severity and sharpness against enemies and transgressors, passionate born and steel campaign and the ineradicable feeling of the unity of God's bollocks." (p. 295.) "It is not from the poor strength of the mind it was born of it, but far more from that of the hot, driving will, of the folded logical understanding, of that peculiar type of sharp logic of thinking directed towards the Zat, which forms one side of the French character and fills French history. None of the French tribes has it more than the stubborn, dogmatic, determined bifard. Based on Luther's reform, this further training of Calvin was no longer Lutheran, no longer "North German" like that one; It also emerged from the southern German-Swiss circle. French was the teaching that inspired them and their master. The national form of innovation was and is found for France. Their sharp, conceptually transparent dogmatism had to have a natural attraction on the Romanesque people" (p. 296).
 "For a Frenchman is calf from head to toe; the logit of his tribe permeates his being" (p. 289).
 The Calbinism of 1559 is far from wanting to be a special power; he wanted to be everything. Today no one will claim that he fought for the basis of toleration. Of course he wanted toleration, no matter how long he needed it: but never as a gentle grace, but as a duty in accordance with the authorities against the truth. The new teaching does not claim this toleration because it is itself equal to other teachings, but it demands it because it follows the word God. One of their wrongdoers, who faces punishment from the authorities

who wanted to ban Keßer, zivang jie, just in 1559, to retract. When, in the summer of the same year, a number of milo-minded parliamentary councilors asked the pastors of the Paris congregations for Bible passages to refute the nonsense that gluttony deserved praise, the pastors gave the flat information: there are no such passages! They wanted experts to judge the quality of the teaching, but the offender should be punished. And they confessed this in the face of the increasing persecution of Henry II. They were convinced that only their teaching would be absolutely correct before the unbribed examiners" (p. 345 f.). You can see how far from heaven true Calvinism and... Coligny were distant from what R. makes of them.

I can also cite a few hatchets from the more recent English book by A. W. Whitehead, Gaspard de Coligny, London 1904, which also came from a non-Fatholic pen, "the violent reports. "The Histoire Écclésiastique (the deeds official history of Huguenotism, written by Huguenots themselves) gives us countless examples (of violence) during the years 1560-63 . . . les that only remotely reminded of Rome, a missal and crucifix, wood and masonry, were knocked down and thrown into the fire... De Foix, writing from his own diocese, before the civil war, describes how it was Huguenots, although not provoked in any way, destroyed altars, choir robes, benches and organs. The irreplaceable library of Cluny destroyed. The soldiers said they were all missals. In the church of Caen the beautiful burial chamber of William the Conqueror was destroyed... In Rouen choir books, missals, psalteries were destroyed In Dives of the Huguenots: they burned a cross that the Gee people had venerated since ancient times" (Page 115). "In Mortagne," Mockery and the burning of the conjugated holy hosts, etc., the vomiting and profanation of the French royal tombs. During the storming of Sully in January 1563, 36 priests were killed, two months earlier, reports the same source, "some priests had fled to the tower; they came down in a different way (i.e. dead)" (p. 117). The most terrible tortures were inflicted on Catholics and Catholics were killed en masse. It is not saying too much when Bastor IX, p. 372, writes: "What "The murderous desire for torment could only be imagined, was carried out on Catholics just because they wanted to remain true to the faith: burying them alive, scalding them with boiling liquid, tearing out their buns, disemboweling them alive and even more horrible things." See also Rouquette, Les St.-Barthélemy calvinistes, Batis 1906. We

really don't like to mention such details because no one else does than it is important to us that the love for non-believers is not diminished by recalling the memory of previous acts of violence. But since R. devotes so much space to the Huguenot struggles, and since one has no insight into the demands of Calbinism to become autocrats and to completely destroy everything Catholic, the hardness of the fight against them, as well as the hardness of the fight against the Waldenjer, after they had allied themselves with the Huguenots, cannot understand, so I had to give at least some hints of the true nature of the struggle on the part of early, aggressive Calbinism. Not by chance, but because Luther had a different orientation, the religious struggles in Germany were incomparably milder. One can also see how little right R. makes of the Huguenots as specific representatives of Germanism.

How little denit one thinks of the many Catholic English martyrs (see I. Spillmann, History of the Persecution of Catholics in England 1535-1681. Freiburg 1910. 5 vols.), those of Scotland and Ireland (see I. H. Bollen, Unpublished Documents relatifs to the English Martyrs. London 1908), to the Irish (cf. A. Bellesheim, History of the Catholic Church in Ireland, Vol. II-III. 1890—91).

9. Paragraphs 75 and 76 of the 1864 syllabus, to which Chamberlain alludes, have nothing at all to do with Dante. He only speaks of the fact that it is wrongly claimed that the secular rule of the Pope is completely incompatible with his spiritual authority (and therefore also a situation such as that which is now created by the agreement between the Holy See and Italy). Chamberlain believes that these sentences are irreconcilable with Dante's theory of the relationship between the church and the state. From this R. makes the "explicit curse of Dante." The syllabus, about which, as is well known, the most remarkable errors exist, is cursed or, as Chamberlain puts it, "doesn't have anything to do with the unbreathable thing at all." It is simply a list of 80 saws that are questionable in some way. What is wrong or questionable about the sentence, and to what extent it is, is not hunted down. Its purpose is to make Catholics wary of ideas that went around the world as slogans in the era of outspoken liberalism and to remind them that even in apparently sensible ideas, upon deeper consideration, there is a false element to a greater or lesser extent Just steden family.
10. The review of all the speeches of Pius IX, edited by Father Pasquale de Francis in four volumes: *Discorsi del Sommo Pontifice Pio IX. pronunziati in Vaticano ai fedeli di Roma e dell' orbe*, 1870-78; 3. T. also in French review: *Discours de Pie IX.*, 1876, has shown that the statement cited by R. not only did not occur in the non-speech to the Neapolitans of January 18, 1874, but not at all finds his speeches. But I do want to tell you how some newspaper or other writer might have made the news, whom R. followed with too much trust. On January 18, 1875, Pius IX. in front of the German reading association in Rome, i.e. not in front of international pilgrims, said: "Ma dall' altra parte state forti et costanti in sostenere i diritti della Chiesa e di questa Santa Sede, delle vostre famiglie, e della vostra fede; Precious this thing is still there in the past and is not visible in the old days or the new serpent. La Germania porge esempi splendissimi di tal forza e costanza, it is also defence-free, this is the account, which is not curata e dispreziata. Corragio adunque: Estote fortes in bello et pugnate cum antiquo et cum moderno serpente" (Pasquale III, p. 421). Ijo in German: "On the other hand, be brave and persevere in maintaining the rights of the Church, this Holy See, your families and your faith, the redeemable treasure that may always remain with you and that may not be torn away from you, neither by of the old nor of the new snake. Germany offers splendid examples of such strength and endurance, and if a defection has occurred, it counts for little, so that on the whole it can be overlooked and considered minor. So good courage! Be brave in the fight and fight with the old and the new serpent." The last phrase is biblical and follows 1. Re. 5, 9, 6a3и an Иpoc. 20, 2. The Pope had to be familiar with it because it was her the antiphon to the Magnificat of the 2nd Vespers of the Commune Apostolorum des Brebiers is formed.
- 10a About Benedict XV. Position on Germany see the valuable essay by Ph. Junk in *Hochland XIX*, 1921/22 p. 649 ff. For the alleged prayers of Benedict XV. Unfortunately, R. does not provide a source to Emil Ludwig (p. 620).
11. For priests there is only a personal declaration of faith, which in no way affects the state. The bishop's oath takes place according to an old form. The passage that referred to the defense against heretics and schismatics has been completely deleted for many years for those countries in which it could be perceived as unfriendly by non-Fatholites, including Germany; so that there are words in this oath that could be offended. Incidentally, the deletion mentions C. Mirbt, sources e.g. story of the Tom. Papacy p. 453, Unm. 1.
12. Cf. A priest of our time: Josef Stoffels, Auxiliary Bishop of Cologne, *Life and Whirl*, from *Speeches and Writings*, høg. by W. Neuß, 1934.

13. Also the passage in question from this *Allofession* of Bius IX. Mirbt has abbreviated in his sources on the history of the Roman baptism, No. 349. With regard to the details of R.'s more recent church politics that are not discussed here, I make the same comment as at the end of the second section. The reader will understand that although it is easy to establish the impossibility of the accuracy of information, it is usually not so difficult to show that reliable sources do not know about it, but it is often very time-consuming to figure out where R.'s information came from -men. How should you e.g. For example, in all your research into the Dante literature, you can find the above-mentioned facts regarding Dante's alleged curse, unless you accidentally come across the passage in Chamberlain that makes everything clear. So I believe that even of the information no longer discussed here, only this one will stand up to examination.

3u II. First section

1. Old Testament. The questions concerning A. 2. have been discussed so thoroughly in the polemical literature of recent years that revisiting them would seem superfluous. But R. himself responded to some of the counterarguments put forward in the last (25th-26th) edition of his book (1934). The best-known are probably Cardinal Faulhaber's 1933 Advent sermons, which deal with the above questions particularly under the topic "The Old Testament and fine fulfillment in Christianity". Compare further 2. Dürt, The salvation-historical significance of the Old Testament (in: *Ufademische Bonifatius-Korrespondenz* 49 1931, 81-95), H. Kaupel, The anti-Semitic combat of the Old Testament, Hamburg 1933; 3. Machens, The Catholic Church and the Old Testament, Hildesheim 1928. Among the Protestant literature we should single out: C. Sellin, Abolition of the Old Testament?, Berlin imo Leipzig 1932; 3. Hänel, The Word of God and the Ulte Testament, Gütersloh 1932; 3. Hempel, Away with the Old Testament?, Gießen 1932.

On the question of inspiration: see the article "Inspiration" in the "Lexicon for Theology and Church" V. Sp. 423-429; B. Goebel, Catholic Apologetics, Freiburg 1930, 446-467; I. Pohle, in Esser-Mausbach, Religion, Christianity, Church I, Kempten and Munich 1911, 338 ff.

1. Cf. the words of the Protestant theologian E. Sellin: "The fact that these (namely Christ and his apostles) actually wanted to stand and stood everywhere on the basis of the Holy Scriptures or the Holy Writings of their people is unbelievable "Theology of the Old Testament, Leipzig 1933, 1).

2. Concilium Vaticanum, Sessio III. Constitutio de fide catholica cap.

2. 3. D.i. according to the context of the Old and New Testaments!

3a. The book by E. Jung cited is currently out of print and it was therefore impossible to check R. for its source. Just before the end of the Drude, however, I came across the recently published 4th edition of another book by the same author. The origin of Jeju, Innsbrud 1934. A look at this book surprisingly explains the quote given by bon R. The news about Jeju's alleged Danaite-Latin descent is actually not found in Ephram, but is reported by E. Jung p. 222 ff. from jög. "inner reasons" are interpreted into a sermon by Ephrem. These reasons turn out to be even less than obvious on closer inspection. In the case of Jacob of Dessa, the fifth Antichrist (!) prophesies that he will come from a Danaite mother and a Latin father.

Ephrem now remarks in one of his sermons that the Untichrist will completely resemble the true Christ in his appearance. E. Jung combines both notes, but he assumed that Jacob of Edessa's remark could well have come from Ephrem, and concludes num: If the Untichrift is to resemble the true Christ, and if it is certain that he will have a Latin father and a Danaite mother, the true Christ must also have the same descent! A simply overwhelming argument! Lund R. writes under omission of the "proof" is simple: "According to the Christian preacher Ephräm (4th century), Jesus had an δαρραι woman as his mother (i.e. a native of Dan) and a Latin man as his father!" Dixi!

4. Poetry and Truth II, 79.
5. Notes on the Divan, Old Testament. Bible — passages according to N. Peters, Ours 171. Both
6. Beyond Good and Evil (1886), No. 52.
7. The open question of whether today's Jews are actually descendants of pre-Christian Jews from a racial perspective cannot be discussed in more detail here.
8. As. R.'s source is again clear here: Friedr. Delitzsch, who also describes the unification of Jahoh and God as an "unparalleled false belief" (The Great Deception 70).
9. Cf. etiva L. Dürr, Das Unsemitische usw., 2 f.
10. See I. Hänel, The Religion of Holiness, 1931.
11. N. Beters near Esser-Mausbach I, 663.
12. See also L. Dürr, Religious Life Values of the Old Testament, Freiburg 1928, 45 ff.; derj., Religion as a community of God in the Old Testament Prophets (in: Akademische Bonifatius-Korrespondenz 42, 1927, 17-26). 13.
- Compare, for example, W. Nowad: "The old Yahweh is the unpredictable one who can do whatever he pleases" (The Books of Samueli, Göttingen 1902, XXVI).
14. So E. Sellin, Theology of the Old Testament, Leipzig 1933, 29; cf. further W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament I, Leipzig 1933, 121 ff.; for individual difficult passages see E. König, Theology of the Old Testament, April 3, Stuttgart 1923, 168 ff.
15. The theology of the Old Testament 11.
16. N. Beters near Esser-Mausbach I, 656.
17. Cf. Lexicon for Theology and Church V, Col. 427; E. Kalt, Biblical Real lexikon II, col. 224.
18. See etiva B. Bartmann, Textbook of Dogmatics II, Freiburg 1923, 490 f.
19. E. Sellin, Theology of the Old Testament, 135.
20. See E. König, Theology of the Old Testament, 218.
21. By the way, Luther would certainly have objected to the fact that he had "rewritten" the Bjalmen. Rather, his translation is very precise, sometimes almost too literal.
22. For more detailed information on this, see A. Miller, Introduction to the Psalms (Ecclesia orans IV) 5-8, Freiburg 1924, 167 ff.
23. Psalm words for the present": German speeches in difficult Beit 13 (Berlin 1914), 3 f. (after L. Dürr, Religious Life Values etc. 117).
24. L. Dürr, The significance of salvation history uiro., 90; see also I. Pohle, Nature and supernatural (in: Esser-Mausbach, Religion, Christianity, Church I, 337 ff.); 24. Rademacher, Onade and Nature, M.-Gladbach 1925, 34 ff.
25. See L. Dürr, The uniqueness of the Israelite religion in the light of today's Near Eastern science (in: Theology and Faith 13, 1921, 129-137); ibid., The Unsemitic and Super-Semitic in the Semitic Old Testament Religion (in: Theology and Pastoral Care 8, 1931, 1-10).

3u II. 3 further section

1. See etiva B. Goebel, Katholische Apologetik, Freiburg 1930, 90-125.
2. Origin and beginnings of Christianity II, Stuttgart 1921, 425 (according to §. Kaupel a. a. D. 23). See also I. Leipoldt, Was Jesus a Jew?, Leipzig and Erlangen 1923; 2. Dürr, The significance of salvation history etc., 95.
3. D. Bardenhewer. Selected writings of St. Ephrem the Shrer (Library of the Church Fathers 37), Kempten and Munich 1919, 190.
4. The Gospel of Mark still applies most to R.
5. See H. J. Vogels, outline of the introduction to the New Testament, Münster 1925, 58 f., 69.

List of names and subject matter

The comments are not taken into account because the numbers in the corresponding texts refer to the corresponding comments

A

Doctrine of the Lord's Supper 99 ff.
Superstition 5, 28
 Indulgence 5, 17 f.
Abraham 73
 Uchelis 15
Achezo o. Worms 45
 Adalbert v. Bremen 45 f.
 Udel 35, 43, 46
 Egyptian 73
 MBA 4, 15
 Mberich v. Spoleto 44
Albertus Magnus 21, 84, 105
 Albigenian War 36
 Albrecht v. Ballstedt
 f. **Albertus Magnus**
Aleander 50, 54 f.
Alexander III. 37
 Mexander VI 48, 51 ff.
 Alfons v. Liguori 48, 53
 Alcuin 29
 As-if philosophy 86
 Old Testament 60 ff., 79, 83, 85
 — Hatred in the 4th 16, 33
 Angelus Silesius 88
 Anonymous v. Laon 37
 Antoninus v. Florence 42
 Apostles 65
 Arbeo v. Freising 40 f.
 Archives, Vatican 25th
 Aribo v. Mainz 26, 45
 Aristotle 83 f., 87
 Arms of Lyon 23
 Poverty Movement 35, 38
Arnold v. Brescia 24, 34 f.
 Arius, Arianism 17, 19, 21 f., 29, 32
 Astrology in Bacon 28
 Ascese 18, 19, 26
 Augustine 4, 18, 21, 23, 83 f., 87, 93, 98

b

Bacchanalia 9 f.
Bacon Roger 21, 24, 27 f.
Begarden } 22, 31, 106
Beguinen }
 Benedict V. Nursia 19
Benedikt IX. 44
Bernhard, hl. 34
Berthold v. Regensburg 46
 Bible 60 ff.
 — alleged Persian influences 69, 71, 78

Bible, alleged Babylonian influences 69, 71
 — and natural science 70 ff.
 — Inspiration f. there
Birt 12, 13, 15 f.
 Bishop's oath 50, 57
Bismarck 49
Boniface VIII. 21, 56
 Boniface, Apostle of the Germans 22, 23, 33, 44, 101
 Borgia, Cesare 53
 Bramante 49, 53
 Doctrine of Penance 18
 Repentance, Germanic term 18
Bußpflege in Cluny 46
Bußsacrament 46
 Büttner 84, 86
 Byzantium 41

C

Calvin 11, 55
Cambrai 33
 Canon Episcopi 10
 Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae 10
Carpjoo 51
 Casti connubii 50
 Chalcedon, Council of 17, 42
 Chamberlain 38, 57, 61, 76, 83, 100, 102
Claudius 6
 Clement IV. 28
Cluniazenser 26, 45, 46
 Chrestos 1, 5 f., 78
 Christianity
 — Origin 1 f., 12
 — Love lesson 20
 — and native language 22, 31
 — Accusations against the 2, 4, 12, 20 ff., 27, 60, 65
 — The survival of paganism in the 30th century
 — negatives 62, 79 f.
 — positives 62, 79 f.
 Persecution of Christians 4, 13 f., 16 f.
 Christianization
 — of the Teutons 22, 27, 34, see especially note 9 in I., 2nd Section, No. 9
 — the Slamen 33

Christ

— Origin 76
 — **Gottesjohn** 76, 77
 — Virgin Birth 77 ff.
 — Messiah 1, 77 f.
 — Miracle 76
 — supposedly rebels 78
 — Personality 1 f.
 — Teaching 7
 — connected with that
 Al. I. 62 ff., 72
Coligny 49, 56
 Consolamentum of the Cathars 35 f.
 Cues, Nicholas of 28

D

Dante 3, 48, 56
 Demons 3, 11, 21
 Decretum Gratiani 25, 43
 Delitzsch 61, 66 f., 68, 72, 76
 German Church 78
 German Religion 82
 Diatessaron 18
 Dinter 76
 Diocletian 4, 12, 15, 32
 Dionysia 9 f.
 Dioscurus 17
 Dogmas 22 ff.
 Dölinger 21, 35, 43
 Donar 22
Donatisten 32
 Dschem, Prinz 48, 51 ff.
Dufour-Helbing 51

E

Edda 22
 Edictum Rothari 10
 Own church system 25, 44, 46
 Edart 48, 50, 81 ff.
 — Conviction 81, 105 ff.
 — **Kirchenfreue** 105
 — Death 21, 28, 105
 Emmeram 24, 40
 Development theory 60 ff.
Ephrem 77
 Erigena, Eriugena 21, 27 f.
 Etruscans 2 f., 7 ff., 9, 24, 48, 74, 109
 Euchar. Congress 3rd Chilago 22nd
 Eugene III 34 f.
 Eusabius 5:18
 Eusebius of Caesarea 4, 12, 14, 17 f.
 Eutyches 17

Forgeries, alleged of the Popes 25, 51
Faulhaber, Cardinal 65, 74
Festivals, Christian 22nd
Feudalism 35
Finance, Papal 51st
Flavian 17
Formosa 44
Francis I. King of Frank-
rich 38

Franziskus 5, 21
Frederick II, Emperor 36
Furtwängler 9

G

Galerius 12 f., 15
Galileo 24, 28 f.
Gandersheim 44
Germanicity 10, 21
George, St. 22, 30
Society 9
Gladiator fights 3
Poison as an alleged weapon
of Rome 21 f., 27
Gobineau 83, 102
Goethe 21, 64
Goslar 33, 34

Goten 21, 24, 29
Concept of God 66 ff., 74, 82, 86
Worship of the ancients
Christians 5
Thank God, Adolf 50

Grafmann 54
Gratian 43
Gratiani, Decretum 25, 43
Gregory V. 41, 44
Gregory VI 44
Gregory VII 23, 33, 41
Gregory IX 36

Gregorovius 51
Greeks 21 f.

Grünwedel 7 f., 10
Guidonis, Bernard 40

H

Hadrian I. 24, 41
Hadrian IV. 34 f.,
Hadrian VI. 25
Haedel 71
Hammerstein, Otto von 45

Hansen 40
Haruspex, Etruscan 2 f., 24
haruspex, Roman 14th century
Haud, Mbert 41, 45
Henry III 25, 33, 45, 46
Henry V. Cluny 24
Helbig 9
Herbig 8, 9
Hersfeld 44

Witches

— **delusion** 3, 10 f., 21, 24
 — **hammer** 3, 11
 — **combustion** 10 f., 52
 — **i. North America** 11
Jerome V. Askoli 28
Hilary v. Arles 5, 20
Hoensbroech, from 54
Hugenotten 49, 55 ff.
Humiliates 38
Starvation among Cathars 35

I

Idealism, German 86
Index 22, 24, 29
India 5

Infessura, Stefano 51
Innocent III. 38
Innocent VIII. 11, 48, 52
Innocent X. 49, 54
Inquisition 36 f., 40 f.
Inspiration 64, 70
Institoris, Henry 11

J

Jahve 3, 4, 18, 21, 66 ff.
Jesuits 26, 48, 53
Jesus s. Christ
John XII 44
John XXII 81, 105
John, Abbot of Malmes-
bury 27
John, Apostles 63:96
Gospel of John 2:7,
 67, 84
Joseph of Egypt 73
Julian Apostate 4
Jung, E. 77
Virgin birth 77

K

Imperial idea, Christian 47
Kant 21, 82, 83
Karl d. Gr. 10, 25, 33, 42, 44
Charles the Bald 27
Cathars 23, 34 f.
 — **Origin** 33, 37, 39
 — **Starvation** 35
 — **Leah's judgment** 37
 — **Teaching** 34 ff.
 — **ungermanic** 36
 — **antisocial** 37
Celts 10
Kemmerich 38
Keßerverfolgung 22, 23, 32 f.
 — **bei Calvin** 55 f.
 — **at Calvinern** 56 ff.
 — **9 million murdered**
Heretic 22, 39 f.

Church 2 f.

— **Roman system** 20
 — **Rome. Centralism** 25, 44
 — **Racial decomposition** 27
 — **and Edart** 104 ff.
 — **and witch madness** 10
 — **and art** 46, 47
 — **and culture** 44
 — **and native language** 23,
 31, 41
 — **and State** 34 f., 36, 47
 — **alleged policy**
Germany 49, 50
 — **Bishop's oath** 50, 57
 — **Priestly oath** 50, 57
 — **Primacy** 4, 19
 — **Nationalkirche** 25 f., 44, 45
Clementine pomilies 19
Cologne 33, 45
colonization d. East 47
Conrad II. 26, 45
Constance 17
Constantine the Great 4, 17,
 25, 32

Constantinian donation 25,
 41 f.

Constantinople, Patriarchate
 of 42

Körte 9

Kretschmer 9
Crusades 26, 47
Crucifix 78, 79
Sorrow, holy 23, 30

L

Lactantius 14, 31
Lay abbots 46
Lombards 10, 41
Latin, Kirchenprache 23, 31
Lateranfonzil, III. 37
Leah 37, 39
Leo I 17
Leo IX 41
Leo XIII 56, 70
Leonardo da Vinci 21
Lipsius Justus 51
Lucius III 34, 38
Ludwig d. Pious 23, 30 f.
Lucretius 48, 51, 53
Luther 5, 11, 28, 50, 54,
 57, 84

M

Madama 53
Macarius 5, 19
Manichaeans 32 f., 36
Marcion 60, 66, 68
Gospel of Mark 76
Martin v. Tours 22, 29

Martyrs, early Christians
 f. Persecution of Christians
 Martyrs' Rafts 24, 43
 Matthew 78
 Maurus Hrabanus 22, 30
 Medicine Man, Pope as 24th
 Meisner, Balthasar 52
 Melanchthon 28
 Michael, Archangel 22, 30
 Monks, monasticism 4, 17
 19, 26, 46
 — Nordic 21st
 Müller, Otfried 9 f.
 Mythological age of the Germanic
 peoples 20th century

N

Nationalkirche 25 f., 44, 45
 New Testament 75 ff., 83
 Neoplatonism 83
 Newton 29
Niebuhr 9
 Netherlands, waste of the 15th century
Niehsche 64
 Nicholas IV. 28
 Nicholas V. Cues 28, 42
 Nizaa, Council 4 f., 12, 17,
 19, 25, 32, 42 f.
 Nuns 5, 18
 North Germanic, Instruction
 33, 45
 Normans 46

O

Odin 22, 30
 Office, sacrum 29
 Victims of the
 Persecutions 38 f.
 Sacrificial prohibitions against Gentiles
 16:32
 Origen 18th century
 Orleans 33
 Ospede, Jean d'38
 Ostara 22, 30
 Easter 30th
Optolonisation 47
Osmald, hl. 22, 30
 Otto I. 25 f., 44
 Otto II 44
 Otto III 25, 44
 Otto v. Freising 34

P

Popes, German 45th
Patristik 83
 Paul II 48
 Paul III 28
 Paul V 29
 Paul 1, 6, 63, 65, 77,
 89 ff., 102
 Pacifism 14

Pelagia 22, 30
 Peter v. Bruns 24, 33
 Peter 22, 30, 77 f.
 Pfaffenspiegel 19, 51
 Philip II 15
 Piccolomini 42
 Pirmin 44
Pippin 22
 Pius II 42
Pius V. 49, 56
 Pius IX 21, 49, 57, 58
Pius XI. 49, 57
Plato 83 f., 87, 90 f.
 Positive Christianity 62,
 79, 80
 Premonstratensians 47
 Priestly oath 50, 57
 Psalms 72 ff.
Pseudodionysius Alero-
 page 27
Pseudoisidorische
 Counterfeits 42
Pseudopyril 25, 43
 Pulcheria 17

Q

Quint 84, 86

R

Radbod 22, 29
 Tendril, from 51
 Raffensoul 2
 Racial chaos 2
 Racial struggle 26
 Racial decomposition 27
 Robber Synods 4, 17
Reformation 28, 60
 Reichenau 44
 Religion of Blood 82,
 83, 100
Rembrandt 72
 Renaissance Popes 25, 48,
 50, 52
 Rhabanus Maurus 22, 30
 Knighthood 26

S

Saxony
 — **herenglaube** 10
 — Instruction 33
 saeculum obscurum 25,
 43, 46
 Saul s. Paul
 Creation from nothing 3 f.
 Creation Doctrine 18, 27
 Sweden
 — **herenglaube** 10
 Consecration of the sword 25
 Scotus Erigena 21, 27 f.
Silvester I. 41
 New Year's Eve II. 41, 44

Sermon on morals
 — the Waldensians 37
 — the Franciscans 38, 39
Sigtus IV. 48, 53 f.
 Scandinavia
 — Witch Hunt 11
 Spoleto, v. 44, 46
Stephan IV. 43
 Stoffels 58
 Strauss, David Fr. 71
 Sturm 44
 Sulpicius Severus 30

T

Tertullian 5, 18 f.
 Belief in the devil 11 f.
 Thegan 31
 Thomas v. Ag. 83, 84 ff., 86
 Edict of Tolerance of Galerius 13
 Tridentine 67

U

Urban IV. 43
 Urban VIII. 29

V

Vacandard 40 f.
 Valla, Lorenzo 42
 Vandals 29
 Vatican. Archive 25
 Vatican. Council 22
Venus 22
 Voltaire 39 f.

W

Waldenser 23 ff., 37 ff.
 Wazo 34
 Military money 18
 Christmas 22, 31
Weiser-Hall 10
 wise men of Zion,
 Protocols of 109 f.
 Wellhausen 68
 Worldliness of the church
 21st-24th 35
 Visigothic Liturgy 22, 31
 Peace of Westphalia 54
 Wibert v. Nogent 33
 Willibrord 29
 Willigis v. Mainz 25, 44
 Winter solstice 22nd
 Wotan 22

Z

Jahn, Theodor 29
 Wizard, burning
 of 36
 Magic Belief 3, 21, 24
 Cistercians 47
 Zwingli 11